

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

IN 1940 a small book by a little-known author appeared under the title *Paul and His Predecessors*. The country's preoccupation with war at that time meant that it received less attention than it merited. Since then the writer has established himself as one of our recognized New Testament scholars, and the author of many well-known books. He is Professor A. M. HUNTER of Aberdeen.

At the request of his publishers, the Student Christian Movement Press, he has now revised the book for re-publication.¹ He tells us that his first intention was to re-write the book, incorporating into it developments in his own thinking since the first edition, and also the relevant contributions from other scholarly writings. This task, however, proved too formidable, and, instead, he has decided to reprint the book in its original form, adding a lengthy appendix, giving his 'second thoughts' on a number of points arising out of the book.

The book when first published was almost a pioneer book in a new field of study, though many have taken it up since then. It aimed at assessing how far Paul himself was to be regarded as an innovator in his theology, or how far he derived his material and doctrine from what was already established in the tradition of the Church. The conclusion was that Paul, far more than many scholars had allowed, rested firmly on his predecessors, and was not to be regarded as an innovator.

In the new Appendix Professor HUNTER declares himself now more than ever convinced of the validity of his main conclusions, and gives grounds for his increased confidence. It may be of interest to summarize the author's present opinion on two of the topics discussed both in the body of the book and in the Appendix.

In the section on 'St. Paul and the Old Testament' he acknowledges that in the first edition

¹ 15s. net.

he accepted as valid Rendel Harris's hypothesis of a Book of Testimonies, an anthology of proof texts designed to prove the witness of the Old Testament to the truth of the gospel, 'a kind of "vade-mecum" for the use of missionaries' in their discussions with opponents or enquirers. These proof texts were regarded as drawn at random from the Old Testament and isolated from their contexts. This theory had seemed adequate to explain Paul's use of the Old Testament. Now, however, Professor HUNTER feels compelled to discard it in favour of the modification of it put forward by C. H. Dodd in 1952. As is now well known, Dr. Dodd has argued that there was not a collection of isolated proof-texts which the early Christians chose from the Old Testament, but rather certain Old Testament sections were recognized as specially significant in that they anticipated and elucidated the main themes of the 'kerygma'. These Old Testament sections were understood as *wholes*; and if we find quotations from them in the New Testament writers, they are pointers to the entire context, not *testimonia* in and for themselves.

'Thus they drew deeply on certain passages from the prophets and psalms, while apparently neglecting other portions of the Old Testament. And when we study the passages most commonly cited, we find that they have a single "plot", with three main variations.' The first concerns the Day of the Lord; the second the New Israel; and the third the suffering and ultimate victory of God's Righteous Servant. 'In other words, the roots of the developed New Testament doctrines of Christ, of the Church and of the Atonement can all be traced back to this pre-Pauline application of the Old Testament scriptures to the Gospel facts.'

'Reading Harris', continues Professor HUNTER, 'you get the impression that the *testimonia* which the earliest Christians compiled from the Old Testament were little more than sticks with which to rap the knuckles of their controversial

opponents. When you read Dodd, you see the *testimonia* were bigger and more positive things, excerpts from prophets and psalmists which gathered together divinely inspired hopes in old Israel of which Jesus and the Church were the fulfilment.'

Professor HUNTER tests out this theory as applied to Ps 69. He notes that one half of v. 9 is quoted in Ro 15³, the other half in Jn 2¹⁷. Was it sheer accident, he asks, that Paul and 'John', neither knowing each other's work, chose the two halves of a single verse for 'testimony' purposes? Is it not far likelier that both Paul and 'John' were following a tradition in which this whole psalm had already been applied to Christ? And, to confirm this, there are quotations of four other verses from this same psalm in Matthew, Mark, John, and Acts.

Further, Professor HUNTER agrees with Dodd in tracing this fresh approach to the Old Testament back to Jesus Himself, 'who first pointed to certain Old Testament Scriptures as providing the clues to His mission and destiny'.

The Appendix contains also a section on Baptism. Professor HUNTER refers to those books in which since 1940 (despite Barth's decision in favour of believers' baptism) Flemington and Cullman have shown the origins of Infant Baptism to be in the New Testament. In them Professor HUNTER also finds his own earlier arguments confirmed and strengthened. He writes: 'The study of early Christian liturgies, or the investigation of the primitive confessions of faith have combined to show that before a word of the New Testament was written, the life of the early Christians revolved round the two focal points of Baptism and the Lord's Supper'. And behind Christian baptism in the New Testament stands the General Baptism of Christ on the Cross for all men. 'Granted that the sacrament is not of Paul's inventing but goes back to the primitive church, can we show that the doctrine Paul associates with it is equally primitive?'

The main passages in Paul alluding to baptism are listed (1 Co 6¹¹ 12^{2f.}, Gal 3²⁶⁻²⁹, Ro 6¹⁻⁴, Col 2⁹⁻¹³) and their teaching summarized: 'For Paul, baptism . . . administered "in the name of Christ" and by immersion signified initiation into God's people—the setting of the individual within the Body of Christ. In this rite . . . the convert died with Christ to sin and rose with him into "newness of life", received the Holy Spirit, and was adopted into God's family.' He argues that

this linking of baptism with the death of Jesus is pre-Pauline and indeed goes back to the words of Jesus Himself (Lk 12⁵⁰, Mk 10⁴⁵).

Paul, therefore, it is maintained, both in his use of the Old Testament testimonies, and in his teaching on the significance of baptism, took over the tradition which he found in the Early Church, and in both cases the tradition itself rested firmly on the words and practice of Jesus Himself.

A modern tendency among New Testament scholars is to treat the references in the Gospels to Satan and to demons as being symbolic ways of indicating psychological phenomena. Even among those who would not follow Bultmann to the full extent of his proposed 'demythologizing' there are many who would allow it for the demonology found in the Gospels. This would be regarded as an outmoded thought-form which can be more accurately expressed in existential terminology.

This point of view is vigorously opposed by Mr. James KALLAS in a recent book on *The Significance of the Synoptic Miracles*,¹ in which he takes issue with many famous scholars (administering sharp reprimands to Otto, Dodd, and Alan Richardson as well as Bultmann) and demands that the demonology of the Gospels be treated as seriously as Jesus Himself treated it.

He begins by reminding his readers that a very large proportion of the Synoptic Gospels is in fact concerned with miracles. Yet modern writers have largely ignored this dominating feature. Richardson in his book on the miracles does face the fact of them frankly, but appears almost indifferent to the fact of their historicity, claiming to find in them meaning even if they may not be accepted as historical fact. Mr. KALLAS, however, insists that their historicity be accepted, and they be seen as an integral part of the message of Jesus as a whole, equally important with the preaching and the parables.

Before dealing directly with the miracles Mr. KALLAS has an introductory section. He reminds his readers of the centrality of the Kingdom of God in the message of Jesus. He claims that while this was normally associated with a King of Davidic type, whose Messiahship would have political and military implications, there was another thought about the Kingdom. This he

¹ S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net.

calls the 'Danielic' hope, which sees the head of the coming Kingdom not as a great mortal, but as a celestial figure, who is called not so much 'Messiah' as 'One like unto a Son of God'. Jesus rejected the former and accepted the latter. The problematic words of Mt 22⁴¹⁻⁴⁵ are interpreted as His forthright renunciation of all thought of the Messiahship of the Davidic type.

By claiming to be the celestial figure of the second type Jesus was asserting His divinity, a claim which is substantiated by His abrogation of parts of the laws of Moses (which only God had the right to do) and by His cleansing of the lepers, which is in fact the lifting of God's curse from human life. The Temptations of Jesus are understood as Temptations to Him to doubt His oneness with God.

The author then summarizes the 'Demonic-Cosmic' background against which we must interpret this self-knowledge in Jesus. For the Jews of that day monotheism was not the belief in one sole celestial being, but rather belief in One who is Supreme over all other celestial beings. Under God there were hosts of angelic beings who at first had been His obedient servants. Even Satan at first had been the servant of God to prove human faithfulness. But it had been recognized that 'there was something malignant, eccentric, and evil in his personality' and by the time of Jesus he was seen to be in revolt against God. He and his satellites had become God's enemies and the process by which this change took place was known as the Fall of the Angels. God, however, was still supreme, and would soon re-establish His Kingdom and crush these rebellious powers, though their final resistance before their ultimate defeat would produce a state of unspeakable chaos and misery, the 'woes' which the apocalyptic writers declared would precede the End.

These writers ascribed the evils of this world to Satan. 'The vermin of the world, the tragedies of human existence, rotten fruit and poor harvest, these were the works of the devil', and Jesus so far from merely accommodating His thought to these concepts, took them over bodily. For Jesus the demoniacs were not specially wicked people, but supremely unfortunate people. Demon possession is not a league with Satan but a bondage to Satan. Human nature is victim, often an involuntary victim, of the perversity of Satan. Sickness and disablement are the work of the Devil, not the will of God. The whole message of Jesus 'was based upon a belief in a demon-possessed world'.

So for Jesus the Kingdom of God, whose coming He declared, the reign of God over this world, meant the driving out of Satan, the cleansing of the world's ills, 'the restoration of the garden where man could walk with God in the cool of the evening and God could say, "It is good"'. It is noted that Jesus never commands His disciples to announce the Kingdom of God (which meant the defeat of Satan) without also commanding 'to cure diseases and to rout demons' (which also meant the defeat of Satan).

The author sharply rebukes those who 'demythologize' the demons of the Gospels, understanding them only as an outmoded form of describing what we now know to be 'psychological phenomena'. 'To do this', he declares, 'is to reduce Jesus to a rather befuddled dogooder who spent all his time chasing harmless spectres who existed only in the imagination of the self-styled afflicted'. It is real not imaginary forces of evil of which Jesus proves Himself Master, and the Cross is the scene of His final victory over them.

Bultmann contends that this belief in demons is part of 'the archaic trappings of a bygone age', and that if modern man is asked to believe in them it will mean completely alienating him from the gospel. But KALLAS will have none of this point of view. 'The fundamental conviction of the New Testament world-view is the belief that there is more to evil than existential bad intentions. There is a non-existential force to which man is subject which perverts all of man's labours, even when his intentions are not bad. . . . Evil seems to be superhuman and endowed with its own malignant power to act even apart from man's intentions.' 'To speak of microbes and amoeba is really no answer to someone who stands over the crib of a dead child.' Bultmann wishes to liberate the gospel from the 'chaotic world view in which it is encased, without damaging its substances', but 'in the demythologizing process we are not left with a conquering Christ but with a philosophical treatise'.

This is a robust, even robustious, affirmation of a conviction, expressed with much eloquence and many telling phrases, that in the miracles we see God establishing His control over the powers of evil. These powers of evil are real and the miracles which dispossess them are real. It is a legitimate point of view, and it is well to face it, but no doubt the scholars who are criticized would have something to say in self-defence.

Under-estimated Theological Books

P. T. Forsyth's 'Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind'

BY THE MOST REV. AND RT. HON. F. D. COGGAN, D.D., LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK

MORE than half a century has passed since this book first saw the light of day. Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton printed it in 1907. My copy, bought in 1949, has the bookseller's pencilled note: 'Scarce. 7s. 6d.'. Did ever a man spend 7s. 6d. to better advantage than I did when I bought this book?

It bears the mark of the age which gave it birth. It reflects the theological conflicts of its day and the particular Church allegiance of its distinguished author. The chapters show that they are lectures (the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching at Yale University) delivered to ministers in training. All that is to be expected and it detracts but little from the value of the book. It is dedicated—in Greek—'unto Him who loved me and gave Himself for me'. That is significant. And the Preface contains these words: 'It has cost the writer much to find his way so far. And he has yet a long way to go. But he believes he has found the true and magnetic North.'

If you are looking for a book which can be mastered with little thought and which makes no demands on the reader, do not take up *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*. If you think that the day of preaching is over and that a little homily of the newspaper-leader-plus-a-dash-of-religion type will do, do not take up *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*—unless, indeed, you are prepared for a shattering experience and a mighty humbling. For this is a book which, like the Word of which it speaks so much, is 'living and powerful, and pierces'. But will there ever be great preaching in the Church until the preachers are pierced?

I venture to say that if the first three pages of this book were digested, believed, worked out and acted on by the men in all our theological colleges to-day, there would ensue a revolution in the ministry and the pulpit work of to-morrow's clergy. We have only reached the second paragraph of the first page when we are told, fairly and squarely, that preaching is 'part of the cultus, and not a mere appendix'. 'Of course', you say, 'nothing new in that.' But how many books on preaching deal in any deep way with preaching as itself an act of worship, in which act both preacher and congregation share? In actual fact, is it not the case that in theological colleges, preaching is still the Cinderella of the course? In actual fact, is

it not the case that our people—yes, our regular church-goers—often know no better than to regard preaching as 'a man talking'? In actual fact, is it not the case that many who have thought out a sacramental theology have not thought out a theology of the Word? We have not got far into the first chapter before we find Forsyth defining grace thus—God's 'undeserved and unbought pardon and redemption of us in the face of our sin, in the face of the world-sin, under such moral conditions as are prescribed by His revelation of His holy love in Jesus Christ and Him crucified'. That in itself is enough to give us pause. But Forsyth goes on to relate this to the activity of preaching. The gospel of grace is an act—not a doctrine, a promise, a book, but God's act of redemption, an objective power, a historic act and perennial energy of the holy love of God in Christ. 'And it is *this act that is prolonged in the word of the preacher*, and not merely proclaimed. The great, the fundamental, sacrament is the Sacrament of the Word' (p. 6: italics mine).

Small wonder, then, that Forsyth contrasts with startling clarity the orator and the preacher—the orator having for his business to make real and urgent the present world and its crises; the preacher a world unseen, and the whole crisis of the two worlds. The preacher is in the succession of the Hebrew prophets. Engaged on preaching, he is engaged on *the gospel prolonging and declaring itself*.

Preaching as part of the cultus—that is laid down on the first page of the first chapter. And it is elaborated in the truly great chapter, the third, entitled: 'The Preacher and his Church, or Preaching as Worship'. The temptation to quote at length is strong, but these brief sentences must suffice: 'The real presence of Christ crucified is what makes preaching. It is what makes of a speech a sermon, and of a sermon Gospel. This is the work of God, this continues His work in Christ. . . . Every true sermon, therefore, is a sacramental time and act. It is God's Gospel act reasserting itself in detail. . . . It is a sacramental act, done together with the community in the name and power of Christ's redeeming act and our common faith.'

Here in Forsyth we have a man who, in a shallow age, was prepared to go deep in his thinking, in his

theology, in his preaching. He hits out against the treatment of sin as if it were but lapse, of God's grace as if it were but love, of God's love as if it were but paternal kindness. He insists that God cares more that we should be great than that we should be happy—'we must regain our sense of *soul* greatness, and our sense of its eternal price'. He pleads for right priorities in the ministry of preaching—'we must rally at the great strategic forts'. What are they? 'In the order of importance we should go to the world first of all with the Atoning Cross which is the Alpha and Omega of grace; second, with the resurrection of Christ which is the emergence into experience of the new life won for us on the Cross; third with the life, character, teaching, and miracles of Christ; fourth with the pre-existence of Christ, which is a corollary of His Eternal Life. . . .' It would be interesting—humbling, perhaps?—to compare this list of priorities with the average diet given in our pulpits to-day. Is a 're-distribution of emphasis' called for?

Right priorities in preaching! And the great majestic themes! Forsyth jumps in at the deep end. Who to-day preaches predestination? (I am asking a question, not giving an answer, but at least suggesting that many find it too 'difficult' and so conveniently by-pass it!) Not so Forsyth. It may be an idea with which most modern preachers feel strangely ill at ease. But is it not written into the warp and woof of our Biblical documents? If we simply by-pass it, are we not jeopardizing the scope and something of the majesty of the message with which we have been entrusted? Are we not reducing the canvas until we have something of the size of a polyphoto—and that not too true to life? Listen to this: 'It is easy for any soft humanist or hard witting to hold up to horror or ridicule our fathers' doctrine of predestination, or reprobation. It is easy because we believe in man (if we do) where they believed in God. We are supremely concerned about human happiness where they were engrossed with the glory of God. We are preoccupied with human freedom, and are not interested (as they were above all) in the freedom of God. We are greatly interested in freedom of thought, and little in the freedom of grace; much troubled about freedom of thought or action, and little about freedom of soul.'

Let it not be thought that Forsyth was a fundamentalist. Far from it. He has a good deal to say on the benefits of Biblical criticism and the error, as he sees it, of the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Bible. But he was one of those great men who seemed to be born before his time—perhaps that is why so many of his books have recently been re-printed, our day being

better prepared to receive his teaching than was his own day. He could see through the analysis of documents which was being ruthlessly pursued in his day to that synthesis which we tend to associate more with what is commonly called the post-critical era. He had the insight—and the foresight—of the prophet.

What is Forsyth's message to the preacher of 1961? I single out a few of the things which I believe he would say to us if he were alive to-day—things which stand out clearly in his book and which we as preachers neglect at our peril.

(1) 'What is the use of captains who are more at home entertaining the passengers than navigating the ship?' Theology is a greater need than philanthropy—so far as the pulpit is concerned. A theology of experienced grace is not merely of the *bene esse* but of the *esse* of the Church. Without such theology 'you have bustle all the week and baldness all the Sunday. You have energy everywhere except in the Spirit'. We need fewer homilies upon 'Fret not . . .' or 'Study to be Quiet . . .' We need more sermons on 'Through Him the world is crucified to me and I to the world', or 'Him who was made sin for us'.

(2) Preachers must be men who do not know the Bible just as a sermon quarry, but who speak from its very interior, as men do who live in it and wonder themselves. The Bible is the one Enchiridion of the preacher still. When that is so, we may expect, as we desperately need, more expository preaching. 'Take long passages for texts. Perhaps you have no idea how eager people are to have the Bible expounded, and how much they prefer you to un-riddle what the Bible says, with its large utterance, than to confuse them with what you can make it say by some ingenuity.'

(3) 'Do not attempt to heal the hurt of God's people lightly' (Jer 6¹⁴ and 8¹¹). 'For God's sake do not tell poor prodigals and black scoundrels that they are better than they think, that they have more of Christ in them than they know, and so on. The conscience which is really in hell is the first to be angered at ingenuities and futilities like these, the more exasperating because of the quarter-truth they contain.'

The Christian preacher must deal faithfully with human sin. Full of compassion as our Lord was, yet it was not the sorrow of the world that broke His heart, but its wickedness. This will involve—this will include—preaching to *social* sin—the social crisis and demand cannot be ignored. But it must be remarked that that will involve knowing the ethic of the gospel on the one hand, and the economics of the age on the other. That is to make big demands on the preacher, but, then, preaching is a demanding thing!

(4) What about the preacher's own doubts, his

own unresolved strivings with truth? 'He is a minister of the Gospel, not a professor of scientific theology. There are truths we must say to all, and truths we should say to some; and there are truths we can only tell to those who ask. It is not the preacher's duty to tell everything he knows about the Bible; but it is his duty to tell everything he knows about the Gospel, and in this reduced yet enlarged sense . . . to declare the whole counsel of God.'

(5) What about those who are impatient of the sermon, who demand brevity before everything else? Forsyth's word is stern. 'Those who say they want little sermon because they are there to worship God and not hear man, have not grasped the rudiments of the first idea of Christian worship. . . . A Christianity of short sermons is a Christianity of short fibre.'

With the insight of a true prophet, Forsyth put

his finger on three things from which the Church of his day suffered. They were triviality (externality), uncertainty of its foundation, and satisfaction with itself. For *triviality*, he prescribed a new note of greatness in our creed, the note that sounds in a theology more than in a sentiment. For *uncertainty*, he prescribed a new note of wrestling and reality in prayer. For *complacency*, he prescribed a new note of judgment in our salvation.

That was in 1907. Is the diagnosis far out for 1961, or, for that matter, the prescription?

It is greatly to be desired that this book should be widely re-read. And with this in view, we are glad to learn that it has been re-printed by the Independent Press. One of the greatest needs of the Church of the 1960's is a revival of its preaching ministry. A study of this book would make no small contribution to that end.

Literature

TAIZÉ

THE Community of Taizé represents a movement of the Spirit of God in France, which has already attracted much attention, and seems likely to make an increasing impact on the life of the Church. Both Catholics and Protestants are turning to it in gratitude and hope. It has sprung out of the Protestant Church in France, but incorporates into its life elements taken from the Catholic tradition, which Protestants have sometimes neglected. A great stress on the sacramental life and a revival of monastic disciplines are characteristic of its witness. Members of the Community maintain their frugal life by the work of their hands.

The Bishop of Sheffield in the Preface writes in deep appreciation of a visit he paid to the community: 'The days spent there were among the most refreshing spiritual experiences that I have been given—a world of hope and joy. The Holy Spirit is speaking to our time through this community of dedicated young men, living and working in the Burgundian village under the creative direction of Roger Schutz.'

Roger Schutz is the Prior of Taizé, and he has written a little book with the arresting title, *This Day Belongs to God* (Faith Press; 7s. 6d. net). It is translated from the French by J. C. Dickinson, Lecturer in Church History at Birmingham University, who also contributes an Introduction. This book is not so much a description of the community and its ways of life as a statement

of the spiritual insights and concerns which led to its formation and inspire its continuance. There is a deep sense of shame at the disunity of the Church, and also at the hunger which many nations still suffer while others have abundance. There is an urgent summons to Christian men to seek a new unity, real and visible, in the Church, in order that their witness may be convincing in the world, and also to seek a more equitable distribution of wealth amongst the peoples of the world.

The Christian is called to live fully in the world, but not to be of the world. He must be a man of peace. In maintaining a peaceful heart before God he will help others to throw off fear, 'that creator of hatred and warfare'. The Christian must learn how to live free from anxiety about the future, for he loses his joyfulness once he lives with an eye on to-morrow. 'There is a madness in the Gospel which contradicts man's want of security.' The Christian, too, will learn how to 'accept others as they are', which is an outcome of compassion for them. Without this enduring attitude of forgiveness to others, 'life among men can become intolerable'.

These are only a few samples of the store of spiritual wisdom in this little book. From them British readers may detect something of the same spirit which we associate with such ventures of faith as the Iona Community or Lee Abbey. Many readers will be glad to know of this book which will introduce them to the hopes which inspire this 'Fellowship of the Spirit'.

C. L. MITTON

FUNDAMENTALISM

The Addresses given at the Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen, 19th to 21st September 1960, have been published by the Church Book Room (4s. net) with the title *The Word of God and Fundamentalism*. This is a paper-back but it is a very important book. There are few books which better set out the case for so-called fundamentalism; there is no book which is more severe on the faults of fundamentalism at its worst; on these faults no so-called liberal could be more severe; and there is no book which at the end of the day is more uncompromisingly loyal to the fundamentalist position.

The word 'fundamentalist' was coined in 1920 in the pages of the *Watchman-Examiner*, a paper which was ready to do royal battle for the fundamentals of the Christian religion as opposed to liberalism. Long before this a series of handbooks on 'the fundamentals' had appeared, and the fundamentals were 'the inspiration and infallibility of Holy Scripture; the personal deity of Jesus Christ and the Virgin Birth as a witness to it; the substitutionary atonement; the physical resurrection of Christ; and His coming personal return'.

There is an excellent chapter on 'The Reformer's View of Scripture' in which Calvin's attitude to Scripture is set down. (1) God speaks to all men everywhere and therefore speaks in a way in which they can understand. (2) New Testament quotations from the Old Testament are seldom *verbatim* but are *ad sensum*, for it is not the words but what they teach that matters. (3) The writers are not concerned to speak in terms of strict scientific accuracy; they speak phenomenally, and their concern is religious truth. (4) They are not concerned to set things down in chronological order. (5) There may be discrepancies in the text of Scripture (cf. Ac 7¹⁴ and Gn 46²⁷). They may be due to a copyist's error, and in any event the religious significance is not affected. (6) The difficulties of Scripture will be greatly lessened with persevering and prayerful study.

Now, if that is fundamentalism, many of us have been fundamentalists all our lives without knowing it. But when in another chapter another writer has this to say: 'Because the Evangelical believes that the words of Holy Scripture are the words of a God who cannot lie, he is bound to maintain that all Biblical assertions are true and trustworthy; i.e., he is committed to the doctrine of Biblical inerrancy'. The writer does not deny the difficulty of this, but insists on holding this view. The plain fact is that, whatever Calvin's theoretical statements were, his practical exegesis as stated above will not harmonize with this.

Whatever one's own view is, this is a book which one must respect. We would wish all 'fundamentalists' and all 'liberals' to read this book. It is notably fair and charitable with one shocking exception. One of its writers in speaking of American fundamentalism says: 'One can sympathize with them in this; for the religious liberalism of such men as A. C. McGiffert, Douglas Clyde Robinson of Yale, Kirsopp Lake of Harvard, Shailer Mathews of Chicago, and the New York preacher, Harry Emerson Fosdick, was a German import of a decidedly anti-Christian brand'. I wish that that had not been written, for to take but one name, it is hard to regard Harry Emerson Fosdick as anti-Christian, for an anti-Christian preacher could hardly lead men to Christ and His Cross—and Fosdick has done so.

Fundamentalism has much to teach us, and we need its teaching, but its advocates will be more effective when they learn to judge not that they be not judged.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

GIFFORD LECTURES

Persons in Relation, by Professor John Macmurray, M.C., M.A., LL.D. (Faber and Faber; 30s. net), is the second and concluding volume of Professor Macmurray's Gifford Lectures. Although it is of the greatest interest in itself, its range, depth, and coherence cannot be appreciated in isolation from its companion volume, 'The Self as Agent'. For in these lectures, taken as a whole, Professor Macmurray has achieved an extraordinary singleness of vision, a feat of a kind that has always been rare in British philosophy, and which, in recent years, has scarcely even been attempted. The result is not only aesthetically satisfying but philosophically impressive.

The danger of such an undertaking is that it will issue in a palace of ice, glittering but ephemeral, which, under the fires of criticism, will melt away without trace. The beauty of Professor Macmurray's work is bound to be damaged by criticism. But its value will survive such defacement for it contains a great deal that must stimulate even those who question the soundness of its foundations. Thus, the whole train of thought from what he claims to be the three fundamental apperceptions—the contemplative, the pragmatic, and the communal—through the discrimination and characterisation of their related moralities and political systems is immensely suggestive and illuminating.

This series of discussions brings Professor Macmurray to the subject of religion. In his view, any satisfactory account of religion must lay particular stress on the following facts: the

universality of religion in human society; that religion, alone among human activities, has no analogue even in the highest forms of animal life; that religion has been the matrix from which the other aspects of culture have emerged; and that 'religion is, in intention, inclusive of all members of the society to which it refers . . .'. Reflection upon these facts of religion leads Professor Macmurray to conclude that its function is to reconcile man with man by overcoming the individual's fears of Nature and his fellows, and consequently, that it is to be defined as 'the celebration of communion', as that which 'expresses the consciousness of community'. Professor Macmurray then shows that the fulfilment of this function demands a theistic world view.

H. J. N. HORSBURGH

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

The Dead Sea Scrolls were bound to figure in a book series such as 'The Teach Yourself Books', and obviously a great responsibility lies on whoever writes for such a series. Three things are expected of him—clarity, adequacy of treatment, and soundness of judgment. On all three counts Professor R. K. Harrison, Ph.D., of Huron College, London, Ontario, has served his readers well in *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (English Universities Press; 7s. 6d. net). In some one hundred and sixty pages he has told the story of the discovery (ch. 1), outlined the contents of the scrolls, mainly Cave One (ch. 2), discussed the dating (ch. 3), assessed their importance for the Old Testament (ch. 4), described the connexions between Qumran and contemporary sects (ch. 5), and discussed the sect and Christianity (ch. 6). He has packed an amazing amount of material into this short compass, and has added notes to each chapter, with good documentation. A short bibliography is also given. The book will provide a wide reading public with as clear a statement as is possible of the background of so much that is still controversial.

When the next edition comes, and this should be before long, perhaps the author will wish to consider some of the following points: In the Introduction he permits a wrong statement that the first discovery was of a jar full of papyrus scrolls. The statement on p. 30 that IQ manuscripts are incomparably more important for the Biblical student than subsequent discoveries is, at least, misleading, for Cave Four has now replaced it in many ways. It is remarkable that Cave Four material is dismissed in less than a page on p. 44, and Cave Eleven (p. 45) is also meagrely discussed. On p. 52 we are led to think that dating the Habakkuk scroll depends 'to a considerable extent' on the identification of Kittim, and the

easy identification of them with the forces of Imperial Rome (p. 68) is not fair to other views despite a note on p. 138. To say that the sectaries had greater regard for Micah, Nahum, and Habakkuk than for Jeremiah or Ezekiel is hazardous; indeed, in view of serious shortage of space, the whole section on the Canon (p. 60–61) could be omitted. Too much is made, I think, of the 'close relationship' (and not identification) of Qumranites with Damascene Covenantes and with Essenes for a book of this size and character (pp. 87–93, 95–98), though the translations of Pliny, Philo, Josephus, and Hippolytus are welcome. The suggestion of Brownlee about the 'messianic' manipulation of Is 52¹⁴ in IQ Isa (p. 106 f.) is given undue weight, and on p. 118 the writer assumes too readily that in the New Testament the Last Supper is to be identified with the Passover Meal.

Among the more serious omissions is a discussion of the 'Essene' farm at Ras Feshha among the archaeological discoveries, and of the 'Essene' Calendar. The bibliography is seriously dated—very little after 1954—and has glaring omissions, particularly Strugnell's English translation of Milik, 'Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea' [1958], or its earlier French edition [1957]; moreover as a short bibliography, it is oddly variable, with many articles far too highly specialized to be of interest to the kind of reader visualised here.

B. J. ROBERTS

THE PAULINE EPISTLES

For some time there has been a pause in the publishing of works on New Testament Introduction and a tendency to rest content with results already reached, or at any rate to await further developments in the course of discussion. This situation is challenged by the appearance of *New Testament Introduction: The Pauline Epistles* (Tyndale Press; 18s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. Donald Guthrie, B.D., M.Th., Lecturer in New Testament Language and Literature at the London Bible College. It may be said at once that Mr. Guthrie's work is scholarly, competent, well-informed, judiciously expressed, and restrained in statement. In disputed questions both sides are carefully stated, with detailed references to older and more recent discussions, not only in important books, but also in learned essays and articles not easily accessible to the general reader. The sheer amount of information in the book is remarkable. Modern students, if they are critically minded, will neglect this book at their peril, even if many of its conclusions are of dubious value.

Mr. Guthrie's standpoint is conservative, and it may not be the worse for that. He has a bias in favour of traditionally held opinions, and is suspicious of critical views which have not outlived their novelty. Such a point of view is advantageous to New Testament studies, for it is always desirable that new theories should be rigorously scrutinized.

Mr. Guthrie admits that some of the more recent hypotheses are not impossible, but after careful examination rejects such opinions as the Ephesian destination of Ro 16, the claim that the 'Sorrowful letter' is to be found in part in 2 Co 10-13, the non-Pauline authorship of Ephesians, the conclusiveness of the argument that the Captivity Epistles were written during an imprisonment at Ephesus, and the case, maintained by P. N. Harrison and others, against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles on historical, ecclesiastical, doctrinal, and linguistic grounds. On the question of the Pastoral Epistles he writes: 'In spite of the acknowledged differences between the Pastorals and Paul's other Epistles, the traditional view that they are authentic writings of the apostle cannot be said to be impossible, and since there are greater problems attached to the alternative theories it is most reasonable to suppose that the early Church was right in accepting them as such'. Mr. Guthrie makes a careful examination of the contention of E. J. Goodspeed, C. L. Mitton, and others that Ephesians headed a collection of Paul's letters after A.D. 90. Any reader who can continue to hold the views Mr. Guthrie criticizes will do so with increased confidence, and if he cannot agree with him, he will none the less have reason to be grateful to him for the clarity of his argument and the temper of his discussion.

VINCENT TAYLOR

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

THE long awaited translation of Dr. Yehezkel Kaufmann's *magnum opus* will be warmly welcomed in the abridged version of Dr. Moshe Greenberg, *The Religion of Israel* (Allen and Unwin; 42s. net), which will be carefully studied everywhere by scholars for whom the eight volumes in Modern Hebrew have been too daunting. It may be said at once that it is quite different from any other book on the subject. The author sets Biblical religion in complete opposition to pagan religion, and maintains that this is true equally for the popular religion, which is so often condemned in the Bible. For the rehabilitation of the popular religion which is here attempted, the Biblical evidence is often inconvenient but is never allowed to be a stumbling-block. It is simply rejected, often on the flimsiest of grounds. Some readers will perhaps welcome the forthright rejection

of the opinions of modern scholars which abound in this work, but they may be less impressed by the discounting of so much Biblical evidence, and especially the evidence of the prophets, for whose veracity Dr. Kaufmann has little respect. He denies the existence of the social ills the prophets speak of, declares that Jeremiah declaimed only against some individuals, and thinks Ezekiel did not know what he was talking about when he spoke of idolatrous symbols in the Temple.

The author holds that monotheism was firmly established in pre-exilic Israel from the time of Moses, and rejects the Biblical view that the people often deserted Yahweh and worshipped other gods. He says the Bible errs in representing the patriarchs as monotheists. Instead, he ascribes to the patriarchal age the baneful infiltration into Israel of pagan ideas and practices, including such Dionysiac features of the cult as the wine festival, libation and ecstatic prophecy. He further regards the whole sacrificial cultus as of pagan origin.

Dr. Kaufmann regards the patriarchs as historical personages, but believes that they have been enveloped in legend. The story of Joseph's being carried into Egypt is interpreted to mean that the Joseph tribe was the first to wander into Egypt. The patriarchal age is placed after the Amarna age in the reigns of Seti I and Rameses II, and the period from Abraham to the Exodus is crowded into less than a century. Moses is regarded as a historical person, but it is surprisingly held that the priesthood of Aaron may well have antedated the establishment of Yahwism, and that the family of Aaron was perhaps a priestly family that had wandered with the tribes and absorbed the various cultures of the lands through which they passed.

On questions of Higher Criticism, the detection of the Pentateuchal sources J, E, D, and P is held to be securely established, but the customary dating of these sources, both relatively and absolutely, is rejected. The views of the Scandinavian school are thought to be worthy of no more than a footnote, and the rejection of their religio-historical views as more paganistic than those of classical criticism is expressed in a sentence. Dr. Kaufmann does not attempt the precise dating of the above-mentioned sources, but places P before Hezekiah and D later than P. He recognizes that Jeremiah was much influenced by the style of D, and notes the close stylistic links between the later prophet, Ezekiel, and the allegedly earlier source, P. Jeremiah is believed to have studied Deuteronomy in Anathoth in his youth, before a copy was discovered in the Temple. Deutero-Isaiah is assigned to a different author from Proto-Isaiah, but there is a much greater recognition of the unity of Proto-Isaiah than has been common. Jonah is placed

very early, and Malachi is brought into the age of Haggai and Zechariah. The final chapters of Zechariah are attributed to a separate prophet, and Hosea is divided between two authors. The Elihu speeches are held to be integral to the Book of Job, which is declared to be pre-exilic, and ch. 28 is ascribed to Elihu.

It will be seen that there is plenty of originality in this book. But there will be few readers who will not question some of these positions, and all will do well to read the book with caution. Again and again positions are stated more strongly than they are defended, and the views that are rejected, whether they are those of Biblical writers or of modern scholars, deserve more careful study than they are here given. For our access to the work, the translator deserves our thanks; but it is improbable that it will leave the mark on future study of the subject that had been expected.

H. H. ROWLEY

WORDS, CONCEPTS, AND IDEAS

Professor James Barr, of New College, Edinburgh, has written a book which tempts to metaphor. It is a masterly display of theological—and linguistic—batmanship, the author hitting out all round the wicket, scoring freely off a varied assortment of bowlers, and pouncing upon the loose ball to despatch it ruthlessly to the boundary. Some of the bowling indeed, on this showing, positively demands to be hit right out of the ground, and is faithfully dealt with.

In more sober, more prosaic, terms, this is a book to make one think, and think to some purpose. The title is forbidding—*The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford University Press; 37s. 6d. net); but it is accurate, for the book is about words and their meanings, and in particular about language and theology. As Professor Dodd has recently observed in these pages, translation is a well-nigh impossible art, since words in any given language seldom carry exactly the same significance, or the same associations, as their equivalents in another tongue—a fact recognized, incidentally, at least as early as the Prologue to Sirach. But how far are these differences indicative of a different mental pattern in the peoples who used the languages? How far is it legitimate to distinguish Hebrew thought from Greek in terms of linguistic structure, and then proceed to interpret the New Testament on the basis of the Hebrew underlying the Septuagint, rather than that of the Greek language itself? The contrast of Greek and Hebrew thought has become common currency in modern theological thinking, but how far can we link this contrast with the linguistic differences between the Greek and Hebrew

languages? And what are we to say when a theology contained in the texts is supported by arguments from the words employed, when the arguments linguistically are demonstrably false? Can good theology go with bad linguistics?

Clearly we are in deep waters, or perhaps on a sticky wicket; but we are only the more indebted for a book which raises these questions and compels their reconsideration. One's chief complaint is that Professor Barr has had to confine himself so much to the negative aspect, the exposure of the linguistic fallacies of the 'Biblical theology' approach. Most of us must confess our errors, either by what we have said or written or by our uncritical acceptance of what has been written by others, but it would have been helpful if he could have shown us, even in outline, a more excellent way. The book inevitably makes demands upon the reader, but it raises questions of importance, and is to be welcomed for the stimulus which it will give to further and more careful thought and study.

R. McL. WILSON

THE GOSPEL APPLIED

The call upon ministers and clergy to deal with their people's emotional and spiritual difficulties is very much on the increase. In Scotland ministers can attend courses on Counselling in Aberdeen and Glasgow Universities; and courses are also given in one or two of the big Mental Hospitals, such as the Crichton Royal, by psychiatrists. We are still far behind America in training divinity students to understand and deal with the relatively minor emotional and spiritual disorders which undermine the sense of moral and spiritual security. We can be thankful to the Epworth Press for publishing so many volumes by real experts in this field.

Dr. Northridge is already well-known by his volume on 'Psychology and Pastoral Practice'. In the volume under review—*Disorders of the Emotional and Spiritual Life* (Epworth Press; 16s. net)—he covers most of the conditions which a pastor will meet on his visitations or in his 'Vestry Hour'. Preachers are apt to forget that however necessary it may be to link the gospel and our faith with world conditions, and with intellectual difficulties, their congregations live personal lives, meet personal problems, face personal and interpersonal relationships and conflicts. These often lead to the conditions of depression, morbid doubt, fear of old age, resentments, etc. Many of our interpersonal relationship difficulties are due to jealousy, self-pity, prejudice, pride, and censoriousness. There are the people who are always looking for something to worry,

about. Dr. Northridge deals with them all, giving excellent illustrations from his own wide experience both as pastor and psychotherapist. This not only gives insight into the root of the troubles, but also guidance in the cure of souls. The volume is not a mere application of psychiatric principles to our stresses and strains, but a real exposition of how the gospel, especially forgiveness, can be applied. Preachers will also find material which will make their sermons relevant to personal needs.

J. G. MCKENZIE

SPIRITUAL TRAINING

The Way of the Ascetics, by Tito Colliander (Hodder and Stoughton; 9s. 6d. net) is a translation—and a competent one—but there is no indication of the original language. It was presumably Russian. Neither does the book say anything about the author, but from the dust-cover we learn that he was born of Finnish parents in St. Petersburg, and that for the last ten years he has worked as Orthodox Divinity teacher in the Swedish schools at Helsingfors.

The book is based on the writings of the Eastern Fathers, from whom he quotes very freely, but without any indication of whether the *ipsissima verba* are quoted, or merely the general sense. Neither are there any references. Asceticism is regarded as strategy against the evil in the heart and is thought of not merely in the negative sense of self-sacrifice, but rather in the more positive way of getting into spiritual training. In fact a rather more exact title might have been 'Spiritual Training according to the Orthodox Fathers'.

There is much that is admirable and of great value in the twenty-six short chapters, meant for devotional reading, but the whole standpoint of the book seems to be that of the Eastern Religious, and one cannot help feeling that some modification is necessary for the man in the world. For example, the author invites us to face up to such questions as 'Is it for *my own* or someone else's pleasure that I am now going to this concert or to the cinema? Am I crucifying my flesh at a cocktail party? Am I going and selling all I possess by taking a pleasure trip or buying this book? Am I keeping under my body and bringing it into subjection by lying down to read?' Obviously the answer is 'No', not only to these questions, but to questions about most of our activities. Few readers of this journal would be crucifying their flesh at a theological lecture, but the conclusion is not an obvious one.

DENIS LANT

PREDESTINATION

John Calvin is more widely known for his doctrine of predestination than for any other belief that was his, though, contrary to common opinion, predestination does not take the dominant place in his system. Nevertheless he wrote a long exposition of it in opposition to his critics, and we are glad to have this work before us in a handy form, translated with an introduction by Dr. J. K. S. Reid, recently appointed to the Chair of Christian Dogmatics in the University of Aberdeen—*Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God* (James Clarke; 17s. 6d. net). Professor Reid's Introduction is a model of its kind. It enables the reader to follow more easily Calvin's sometimes involved arguments, and at the same time it stresses three points at which Calvin's doctrine is open to criticism as showing inadequacy. This handling of a difficult subject is acute and lucid. We know none that is more to be commended.

STEWART MECHIE

THE TOTALITY OF KNOWLEDGE

It may be symptomatic, and it is certainly refreshing, to discover a book about knowledge by a contemporary professional philosopher which mentions science only in passing, while considering in detail departments of experience such as art and religion. This unusual distribution of emphasis is deliberate. In his Preface to *Ways of Knowledge and Experience* (Allen and Unwin; 40s. net) Professor Louis Arnaud Reid refers to 'a need for a kind of philosophical writing which, though not unaware of current controversy and idiom, proceeds in its own analytical and constructive way. Being to that extent detached from recent idiom, it may help to reinforce the returning interest in man's total field of experience and enterprise.'

Besides religion and the arts, two other modes of experience are explored at length—those of morality and personal relation. The ostensible objective of the book is to exhibit each of these as providing knowledge; so that if any is ignored, our conception of knowledge remains limited and incomplete. The method of treatment, however, is somewhat at war with this purpose. Each field is treated separately, almost as an isolate from the totality of experience; and in each case there is a strenuous effort to provide an adequate empirical account which will do justice to the facts. In its proper place such an approach is admirable. But here it has the effect of isolating the different fields with systematic thoroughness from one another, by stressing differences at the expense of what they have in common. We are

provided with four theories—of art, of religion, of morality, and of personal relations—each interesting in itself and inviting controversy, but which do not easily reveal a unity underlying the differences of their material. In consequence, the effort to vindicate the claim of each to provide knowledge seems a little forced, and suggests that the term 'knowledge' is perhaps being used in different and even incompatible senses.

It would be quite misleading, however, to stress such negative criticism in dealing with a volume which is so rich in important insights, and which has so much of value in detail to offer its readers. In every chapter things are said which are original and arresting, and the comment upon what is so brought to our attention is often, in spite of its novelty, convincing. One cannot read the book attentively without enrichment. Particular attention must be drawn to the treatment of the use of symbols, in the different fields, for the expression and articulation of the kind of experience they provide. It seems to me illuminating, and particularly in the case of religion. A major difficulty facing the intelligent modern when he approaches religion springs directly from the tendency, against which this book is a protest, to reduce all expression of knowledge proper to the scientific assertion, in the most literal fashion, of what is matter of fact, and so to confine us to statements which, in the most direct possible manner, can be either true or false. Professor Reid's analysis of the place of myth in the expression of religious experience, and his insistence on distinguishing, in the use of mythical statement, between what is valid and what is invalid—this speaks directly to our condition, and is capable of resolving many perplexities. It should become familiar to all who have the interest of religion at heart.

JOHN MACMURRAY

In *The Paradox of Tragedy* (Allen and Unwin ; 16s. net) Professor D. D. Raphael has given us a sensitive, a beautiful, and a penetrating book. Aristotle said that the use and the delight of tragedy was that it caused a purgation of pity and fear. The trouble about this is that it implies that pity is a bad thing and real pity can be purged by this experience of a fictional situation. But the real tragic experience is to see a great-spirited man pitting himself against some ineluctable situation.

When the tragic situation is brought into the light of the religious situation, then there are two strange consequences. First, in the religious situation there can be no such thing as tragedy, for the religious belief is that in the end all things are good, and that there is no such thing as wasted, aimless suffering. Second, in the religious situa-

tion, the religious man cannot struggle ; he must of necessity submit to God. 'Iphigenia tries to escape her fate ; Jephthah's daughter accepts hers without question. Prometheus defies Zeus ; Job lays his hand upon his mouth.'

We have only touched on one side of this book, which has chapters on Why Does Tragedy Please ? Tragedy and Religion, The Philosopher as Dramatist—Plato and the Greek Drama, The Dramatist as Philosopher. This book embodies The Mahlon Powell Lectures for 1959. We hope that it will find many readers for it has something to say and it says it with wisdom and beauty.

We have received a booklet entitled *Mar Thoma Church in Peril* and written by Mr. K. N. Daniel. The peril that he sees threatening this Church in Southern India is a reactionary movement calculated to turn it from its evangelical position towards ritualism and sacerdotalism, and this he finds focused in the purpose of the present Metropolitan to lead it to reunion with the Jacobite Church. Over these issues there seems to be already something like a schism in the Mar Thoma Church. We do not know enough of the background to appreciate all the points made, but it is clear that the leaders on both sides need the prayers and help of other Christians. The price of the booklet is Rs. 2, and we presume copies are obtainable from the author at the Bible Institute, Tiruvalla, Kerala, India.

Stipend in the Church of Scotland, by the Rev. A. J. H. Gibson, D.D. (Blackwood ; 30s. net), is a book that ought to be read by every minister and office-bearer of the Church of Scotland. It will prove of interest to many others, for besides giving detailed information about every aspect of the contemporary Fund for the Maintenance of the Ministry in that Church, it provides an account of the methods formerly used in Scotland for the same purpose and traces the nucleus of the Fund, now known as standardized stipend, back to the old teinds or tithes which were based on the Mosaic provision for priests and levites in the Jewish Church, and it in turn derives from a custom in patriarchal times or earlier. No one is better qualified than Dr. Gibson to write such a book and we are glad that he has taken time after his retiral to write it.

Sects and Society, by Mr. Bryan R. Wilson (Heinemann ; 35s. net), is a sociological study of three of the larger sects in Britain to-day—The Elim Foursquare Gospel Church, Christian Science and the Christadelphians. In each case the author collects his material under five heads—the teachings of the sect, its history, its organization, its

social attitudes and its social composition. He also considers such questions as the schisms that have arisen, the methods of recruitment and the persistence of the second generation. This is a valuable book for the information it contains, quite apart from the sociological judgments on the three sects, which are of vital interest to all who are concerned with the appeal of religion in the modern world.

The confession of faith of a working scientist ought to be helpful to many other people, hence we welcome *A Scientist Who Believes in God*, by Dr. H. N. V. Temperley (Hodder and Stoughton; 15s. net). The author, brought up as a Christian, passed over to an agnostic position in his undergraduate days, and came back gradually to a Christian philosophy of life which now satisfies him. Some of his comments on particular doctrines may be questioned, but he argues cogently that, while the evolutionary-materialistic view can explain a great many of the facts about the universe, there are other facts that require a theistic explanation. His scientific method gives weight to the conclusion that there is a view of the universe reasonably consistent with the known facts about it and close to the spirit and letter of the Bible and of Christ's teaching.

This excellent little volume—*Spiritual Therapy*, by Richard K. Young and Albert L. Meiburg (Hodder and Stoughton; 15s. net)—is accurately described in the sub-title as 'A new approach to treatment based on actual hospital cases'. What a distance these Americans have travelled in collaboration between ministers and doctors and psychiatrists! This volume shows how the minister becomes one of a 'Healing Team' and how effective his contribution can be. In his 'A Theory of Disease' Dr. Guirdham of Bath stressed the fact that our personality type determines what ailments we are likely to suffer. Here these chaplains with the help of the rest of the team—every chapter has been vetted by doctors or psychiatrists—show us the kind of personality likely to suffer from Migraine, Asthma, Heart affections, Skin diseases, etc. The message of the book is simply this: it is not enough to understand the symptoms of a disease of the psycho-somatic kind, we need to know the personality of the victim; only then can we apply the right treatment. It is a fascinating volume, well illustrated by case histories, and the actual method of the chaplain once he has been called in. We see how to appropriate the knowledge of man's conflicts psychiatry has gained for us, and how pastoral care can more effectively be given in the light of this information. In an Introductory word

Clarence Hall, senior editor of 'The Reader's Digest', gives an apposite illustration of a case where the ministry of the chaplain was essential for the cure. Pastoral care of an informed kind can be medicine's greatest ally in this age with its stress diseases. Not only chaplains and ministers will profit from this book, but psychiatrists will be stimulated to correlate personality type with the particular psycho-somatic or mental symptoms of their patients.

Come Wind, Come Weather, by Mr. Leslie Lyall (Hodder and Stoughton; 4s. 6d. net), purports to be an account of the present experience of the Church in China under the Communist regime. The publishers claim that the author 'is perhaps the greatest authority on the situation in the Chinese Church'—a large claim for a vast land. We must never forget the suffering and trials of our brethren behind the bamboo curtain, but the writer is extremely coy about his sources of information, and one is uncertain as to what he means by 'the Church'.

A useful little book for teachers in day school or Sunday school is *Great Christians*, by Mr. Norman J. Bull, M.A. (Hulton Educational Publications). It is Book 4 in 'The Church in All the World' series, and contains short chapters on twenty famous missionaries from William Carey to Gladys Aylward. There are attractive suggestions for questions and 'things to do'.

The Rev. Dr. Leon Morris, Vice-Principal of Ridley College, Melbourne, has already proved himself in earlier publications an effective exponent of Bible doctrine. He makes a further useful contribution in this sphere in a series, published by the Inter-Varsity Fellowship, entitled 'Great Doctrines of the Bible'. The theme treated by Dr. Morris is *Spirit of the Living God* (4s. net). In simple language the teaching of the Bible about the Holy Spirit is presented. The aim of the book is to treat the subject 'in a non-technical way for the general reader', and this is done with great success. This should prove itself a very useful little book both for private and for group study.

It is not often that a series of four lectures on the Synoptic Gospels is judged worthy to appear in a second impression after the lapse of almost a generation. This signal honour has been paid to *The Synoptic Gospels*, by Professor James Hardy Ropes, of Harvard, U.S.A., first published in 1934 and reviewed in this Journal (xlii. 112). A new Preface has been written by Professor D. E. Nineham, and the brochure is published

by the Oxford University Press (7s. 6d. net). Dr. Nineham says that 'mature students who go back to them can be sure of finding hints for further study and reflection'. Professor Ropes will long be remembered as the author of the third volume of Jackson and Lake's 'Beginnings of Christianity' on the text of the Acts, the I.C.C. commentary on 'St. James', and 'The Apostolic Age'. Although highly commended by R. H. Lightfoot and cited as an authority by Abbot B. C. Butler, it cannot be said that his standing as a writer on the Synoptic Gospels is equal to his high reputation as a textual critic and a Church historian. In the lectures under review he has justly emphasized the theological importance of Mark and the Evangelist's concentration upon the question, 'Why did the Messiah die?', the aim of Matthew to produce a systematic manual of what could be known about the life of Jesus and His teaching, and the direct biographical intention of Luke. But, unfortunately, a number of doubtful statements are made, including a virtual rejection of the 'Q' hypothesis, with no other argument than that no ancient writer seems ever to have heard of it, and a preference for the view that Luke derived the sayings of Jesus from Matthew, with no arguments at all. Luke, Professor Ropes maintains, is the least instructive of the Gospels to the modern critical historian. Of Mark he writes, 'And yet it is true to life as no picture of Jesus, outside of these three gospels, perhaps no other even within them, least of all any modern one, ever has been; it is a commonplace, and a true one, that in it the convincing portrayal of a real man is opened before us'. This is a remarkable statement coming as it does from a scholar who says, 'Mark's motive was not historical but theological, and in that respect his book should be classified with the Gospel of John'.

The Re-making of the Nation, by Miss Elsie Broadie, M.A., S.Th. (Religious Education Press; 6s. 6d. net), is Book 4 in the series 'The Chosen Nation', and deals with the period from the Exile to the Time of Christ. A sound background book for use in the upper forms of secondary schools, covering a period of Biblical history which is almost unknown to the average teacher.

God and History in the Old Testament, by Dr. Harvey H. Guthrie, Jr., Assistant Professor of the Old Testament at the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass. (Seabury Press, Greenwich, Conn.; \$4.25), is an attempt to pick out the distinctive ways in which various parts of the Old Testament bear witness to God's relation with men and His activity in human history. Thus in

the Law, the documents J and E are said to interpret the course of Israel's history in terms of the Exodus deliverance and the covenant-making at Sinai; but whereas J honours King David and his house as the means by which Yahweh continued to rule His people, E, representing the opposition of the north Israelites to kingly pretensions and intrigues, continues to exalt the work of Moses. The prophets in turn witnessed to the sovereignty of God, describing attempts at political power on behalf of Israel as a disregard of that sovereignty and foreign alliances as distrust of it. The priestly interpretation of history, as exemplified after the Exile, emphasized the theocratic state, in which Yahweh alone is enthroned and the King has no place, and the holy people worshipped God in His temple, despising political power. And the Wisdom literature protested against the bonds of orthodoxy and a hardened system of doctrine and practice, and dared to ask questions and dared to doubt. This is an inquiry which is vigorously pursued, even if it is sometimes too simply and unilinearly presented; and not without good reason does it maintain that the basic question in the Old Testament is not 'How is God found?', but 'What does history mean?'

Of the new things that are coming out of Africa in these days we have one that deserves notice—a book by Professor N. Q. King of the Chair of Divinity in the University College of Ghana, published at 21s. in the S.C.M. 'The Library of History and Doctrine'. Its title is *The Emperor Theodosius and the Establishment of Christianity*. It fills a gap in scholarship by taking account of recent Continental and American writing and presenting a well-documented study of the religious policy of the Emperor who advanced beyond the position of Constantine and his immediate successors and founded the orthodox Christian Empire on the repression of both heresy and paganism. Such a study has relevance to the emergence in Africa to-day of new states which have to make a decision about their official religion, if any. As Professor King suggests, they and groups within them 'can learn from the fourth-century Roman settlement what happens to a religion when it takes over or is taken over by the State and what happens to the State'.

Messrs. Henry E. Walter have added to their 'Campbell Morgan Pocket Library' four more volumes—*Simple Things of the Christian Life*; *Life's Problems*; *Discipleship*; *The Practice of Prayer*. The price of the first three is 3s. 6d. each and the last volume is 4s. 6d. net.

The Natural Theology of Teilhard de Chardin

BY THE REVEREND JOHN MACQUARRIE, B.D., PH.D., THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

JESUIT priest and authority on evolution—the combination is sufficiently unusual to afford a partial explanation of the leap into public notice of the late Pierre Teilhard de Chardin and his book, *The Phenomenon of Man*. Experts have been sharply divided in their estimates of his work. Sir Julian Huxley praises it highly, and believes that its 'influence on the world's thinking is bound to be important'.¹ Professor P. B. Medawar condemns it as mostly nonsense, and thinks that what sense there is in it constitutes 'a feeble argument, abominably expressed'.² Teilhard's own Church seems unable to make up its mind. He was refused permission to publish during his lifetime, and we look in vain for the *imprimatur*; but Father J. L. Russell tells us after a careful analysis that if his interpretation of Teilhard's views is correct, then 'there does not seem to be anything unorthodox in them'.³ We shall see indeed that more than one interpretation is possible, and that a sober estimate will avoid flying to the extremes either of adulation or vilification.

Teilhard claims the naturalistic starting-point of a scientist. Quite in the manner of Mach and Pearson, he says that his aim is not to *explain*, but simply to *see* and *describe* the phenomena. Yet before he has finished, he has moved from science into the fields of philosophy and theology. Obviously the crucial stages of his argument are the points where he makes his transitions from one of these fields to another, and to these transitional points we must direct our attention.

What then does Teilhard see when he looks at the phenomena? He sees first a *process*: he takes a dynamic view of the world, the fundamental stuff of which, if we may so speak, is energy. More than this, he sees an *evolutionary* process, having a discernible pattern. We see the building up of increasingly complex unities or systems out of the multiple packets of energy which constitute the matrix of things. Elemental particles build up into atoms, these into molecules, these into living cells, these into multicellular organisms.

¹ In his Foreword to *The Phenomenon of Man*, 26.

² *Mind* [January, 1961], 99.

³ *The Heythrop Journal* [January, 1961], 13.

Teilhard makes two important points about the evolutionary process. [The first is his recognition of thresholds or critical moments, when complexity reaches a stage at which there occurs a change of state, and something new emerges.] For instance, life appears after a sufficiently complex series of chemical substances has been built up. An analogy would be the coming of a liquid to the boiling-point, when a continuous process is interrupted by a leap into a new state. Teilhard's second point—perhaps not easily reconciled with the first one—is that '[n]othing could ever burst forth as final across the different thresholds successively traversed by evolution (however critical they may be) which has not already existed in an obscure and primordial way'.⁴ For instance, when we look for the beginning of life, we lose sight of it in intermediate stages between the living and non-living. This continuity leads Teilhard to a kind of panpsychism or panvitalism: life and mind reach down into the 'inanimate' world, though in very rudimentary ways which we may call 'pre-life' or 'pre-mind'. With this theory goes the rejection of any dualism of mind and matter, and this is of course entirely consonant with the view that all things have a common matrix in energy. The mental and physical are two sides of a single energy, the 'without' and the 'within'. This denial of dualism presumably means not only that the physical always has some degree of mentality, however rudimentary, but also that the mental is never without its physical concomitant. This conclusion seems to follow also from Teilhard's important law of complexity and consciousness, which affirms as a general character of the evolutionary process that increasing complexity of energy-patterns is correlated with advance in the directions of life and consciousness.

While Teilhard seems to claim that his evolutionary theory holds good, at least in principle, for the universe as a whole, the detailed working of the process can be fully seen only on our own planet. Here the major critical thresholds have been first, the emergence of life from the non-living materials of the earth, and next, the appearance of man as the bearer of reflective

⁴ *The Phenomenon of Man*, 71.

thought. With this second event—'hominization', as Teilhard calls it—evolution becomes conscious of itself and within limits able to direct itself, and man becomes its spearhead on the earth. Teilhard describes the process of terrestrial evolution in a slightly different way, in terms of the building up of new concentric layers or envelopes on the earth's surface. In addition to its purely physical layers, the earth has, so to speak, clothed itself with a 'biosphere', the film of interconnected life which covers its surface, and with a 'noosphere', a mental envelope which includes not only men but also their fields and cities and all the products of human intelligence.

Teilhard now becomes more speculative, but we should notice that as yet there is no break with his phenomenal starting-point. What he attempts is to make an intelligent extrapolation of the observed evolutionary process into the future. He assumes that the law of complexity and consciousness will continue to operate. He visualizes this as taking place through the emergence of a new kind of social organic unity accompanied by a higher suprapersonal level in the evolution of consciousness. [This next stage or threshold in the evolutionary process he calls the 'omega-point'. It is not entirely clear whether the entire cosmos tends to the omega-point, or only the earth. If the former is the case—as Teilhard sometimes seems to maintain—then perhaps the consummation of terrestrial evolution would be only, let us say, a sigma-point, with an indefinite number of new thresholds to follow before the true omega-point is reached.]

Is the omega-point to be identified with God? Teilhard certainly comes near to such an identification, and it is at least clear that at the omega-point all things are brought into a suprapersonal unity in God, though it is said that this does not mean the obliteration of personality. God, on this view, would seem to be the final rather than the efficient cause of the universe, gathering all things into a perfect unity in Himself.

Teilhard has already told us that no matter how critical any evolutionary threshold may be, the novelty which emerges must already have existed in some primordial way. This must be true also of the omega-point, and here we see Teilhard's link with Christian theology. [The self-transcending love manifested in Christ is a reflection or foretaste of the perfect unity which will be attained at the omega-point, and in the loving society or agapastic community which Christ inaugurated as His mystical Body the end is already being realized in our midst.] The central Christian doctrine that God is love is indeed, according to Teilhard, manifested throughout the whole evolutionary process, for even the attractions and

affinities that build up new unities on the physico-chemical level are prefigurings, however primordial, both of love and of its mystical consummation at the omega-point.

The present writer is not competent to criticize the many scientific considerations adduced by Teilhard in support of his thesis. No doubt many of these considerations would be regarded as debatable by experts, but presumably his general outline of evolution is acceptable.

When we turn to the philosophical and theological questions, the first thing to do is to locate Teilhard on the map of contemporary thinking. This is not difficult. As far as his dynamic world-view is concerned, Teilhard stands in the closest affinity with the process philosophies, and indeed he says nothing of importance that has not already been said—less picturesquely, perhaps, but with more philosophical rigour—by such thinkers as Samuel Alexander and A. N. Whitehead. The doctrine of emergent levels of evolution is set forth in detail by Alexander, and he too claims that complexity is the governing factor. He says: 'Ascent takes place, it would seem through complexity. But at each change of quality the complexity as it were gathers itself together and is expressed in a new simplicity. The emergent quality is the summing together in a new totality of the component materials'.¹ The denial of dualism and the correlation of physical and mental phenomena is also in Alexander, but perhaps the closest parallel to Teilhard's way of expressing it is found in Whitehead's doctrine of the dipolarity of actual entities. According to this doctrine, all actual entities from God down to the veriest speck of dust have both a mental and a physical pole, though in the case of the speck of dust, the mental pole is very rudimentary.² A doctrine of panpsychism is, of course, one of the oldest things in philosophy. According to Aristotle,³ Thales taught in the dawn of philosophy that 'everything is full of gods'. Thales is also said to have thought of the earth as a large animal, floating on the waters from which it arose and perhaps nourishing itself on them. One is vividly reminded of this teaching when Teilhard talks of the early earth as an 'incredibly complex germ'.⁴

To have traced Teilhard's philosophical relationships will provide us with some useful comparisons in assessing the value of his world-view. For it would seem that at least two quite distinct interpretations of this view are possible. The first interpretation takes seriously Teilhard's statement that he is confining himself to the observable

¹ *Space, Time, and Deity*, ii. 70.

² *Process and Reality*, 50.

³ *De Anima*, 411 a 8.

⁴ *The Phenomenon of Man*, 72.

phenomena, and if this is so, his philosophy must be read in naturalistic terms, and would very closely resemble that of Alexander. In Alexander's scheme of emergent evolution, space-time is the matrix, and the levels ascend through matter, life and mind to deity, which lies in the future and represents the next stage after mind. [If we read Teilhard in naturalistic terms—and he himself invites us to do so—then his God must lie within the phenomenal world, that is to say, within space and time, and must therefore be a natural rather than a supernatural God. This God is found at the end of the universal process, not at its beginning. He is the *terminus ad quem* of all things, not their *terminus a quo*. This indeed is implied in designating him 'Omega' rather than 'Alpha'.] Such a God, moreover, will be complete and perfect only in the future. He is a God who is 'on His way', so to speak, not a God of eternal static perfection. Of course, this God, like everything else that has emerged or will emerge in the universe, must be thought of, in accordance with Teilhard's principles, as already existing in a primordial way. But this means that at any stage of the process He exists only as a potentiality, or as a godward trend in things. If we may coin a word in analogy with Teilhard's 'pre-life' and 'pre-mind', we may say that at any given point in the evolutionary process, He is a 'pre-God'.

Furthermore, if we take seriously Teilhard's rejection of dualism, we must suppose that his God, like everything else in Nature, has His physical as well as His mental side. Teilhard plainly says¹ that the higher mental levels are reached only through the building up of large brains—just as Alexander maintains that mind is found only in correlation with neural systems. We must therefore suppose that a divine intelligence would require to be correlated with a physical system of unimaginable complexity. [Teilhard's law of complexity and consciousness does in fact suggest that the entire material of the universe, that is to say, God's physical aspect, is building up into a single unified organic system of such complexity that a brain or electronic machine would provide only a faint analogy, but a system which would be necessary as the substratum of a divine Mind.]

Is this pantheism? Teilhard indeed speaks of the goal of evolution as a state in which God will be 'all in all', but to the charge that the interpretation of his views which we have just sketched out is a pantheistic one, it is possible to make exactly the same reply that Alexander makes to a similar charge against his view of God. Alexander says: 'God is immanent in respect of his body, but transcendent in respect of his deity . . . and

since his deity is what is distinctive of him, this notion of God remains predominantly theistic'.²

The point of this remark is that while the physical aspect of God coincides with the whole spatio-temporal universe, His mind or deity belongs only to a portion of space-time—the portion namely towards which the evolutionary process advances and to which we, as it were, look onwards and upwards. To say that God is transcendent means that He is always ahead of us, and perhaps this interpretation of 'transcendence' is as intelligible as either the mythological image of a God in the sky or the metaphysical notion of a God 'outside' of space and time.

This first interpretation of Teilhard's natural theology is probably not the one that he himself wants us to take, but it is certainly the one which is most consistent with his premises. No doubt it involves some speculative assumptions, but on the whole it remains within the phenomenal orbit. Assuming that evolution does not end with man but that it will continue in its observed direction, [this interpretation visualizes by intelligent extrapolation the emergence at some more or less distant point of a natural God, a higher threshold of being to which we would ascribe the quality of 'deity'.] This is at least an intelligible hypothesis, based on the kind of evidences which Teilhard adduces. Whether his conclusions are true in fact depends on the validity of his description of the phenomena and is therefore a matter for the scientists to determine; but there is no logical obstacle in the way of such conclusions.

[The second possible interpretation of Teilhard's natural theology is a much more orthodox one. It visualizes a God who is supernatural, transcending space and time; who is purely spiritual in His being; and who is the 'Alpha' as well as the 'Omega', having in the beginning created the universal process out of nothing in order to raise it to Himself through successive stages. This is presumably the interpretation which Teilhard wants us to take. He argues that 'Omega' not only ends the process but stands outside of it as transcendent; and he speaks of mind detaching itself from its material matrix at the end of the process, and continuing in a liberated independent existence.³ But if orthodox theism is the conclusion which Teilhard wishes us to draw from his argument, we are bound to say that it does not follow at all. In the first place, such a conclusion offends against his intention to stay within the phenomena, for he has now leaped beyond the phenomena into a transempirical supernatural region, and such a leap involves here a logical hiatus. In the second place, he has abandoned

² *Space, Time, and Deity*, ii. 394–396.

³ *The Phenomenon of Man*, 270, 288–289.

¹ *Op. cit.*, 154.

that rejection of dualism which was foundational to the earlier part of his argument, and indeed when he talks of mind getting liberated from its material matrix, he has swung over to a thorough-going dualism which is reminiscent of the ancient Gnostic and Manichaean ideas about spirit escaping from the matter which imprisons it. In the third place, if evolution were controlled by a perfect Mind outside the process, we would expect it to have a different character from the one Teilhard describes. [For he frequently insists on the 'groping' character of evolution, which tries everything before finding the way forward.] This suggests not a transcendent Intelligence but an immanent *nisus* or directed striving, not a God who is complete but one who is 'on His way'.

So we find ourselves in something of a dilemma. If we accept Teilhard's premises, we have to draw unorthodox theological conclusions; while if we accept Teilhard's orthodox conclusions, we have to reject his premises and abandon the whole argument on which he bases his conclusions. The ambiguous meaning of his book may explain the suspicion with which it is regarded in his own Church. In Roman Catholic theology, God is pure act, but Teilhard's conception seems to bring potency into the idea of God.

More important than the question of orthodoxy is the question of whether an emerging God, the more plausible conclusion from Teilhard's argument, can be a religiously satisfying conception. Does not the religious consciousness demand a God who is eternally complete and perfect? Perhaps it does. But we may at least refer to the arguments of an American disciple of Whitehead, the philosophical theologian Charles Hartshorne, who maintains¹ that the dynamic conception of a God who has still to complete Himself is more in accord with the Biblical picture of the 'living' God than is the static conception of a God of unchanging perfection—an idea which Hartshorne attributes to Greek influences on Christian theology. The dynamic conception, Hartshorne claims, gives meaning to the idea that responsible human beings are in a genuine sense 'co-workers' with God; and in addition this conception eases the problem of evil, which has been so intractable for traditional supernaturalistic theism.

Finally, we must look at the way in which Teilhard connects his natural theology with Christianity. Here, again, there is nothing new. A generation ago, the Anglican theologian, L. S. Thornton, saw an analogy between the Christian

doctrine of incarnation and the way in which each emerging level of the evolutionary process gathers up the earlier levels into a new unity. He says: 'As the series is taken up into the human organism, so in Christ the human organism is taken up on to the level of deity'.² Like Teilhard, Thornton thinks of this advance in social terms—it is the emergence of a new social organism of which the bond is love, the mystical Body of Christ in which all humanity is sanctified and deified. Once again these ideas have a long history; they go back to the early days of the Church, and to the New Testament itself. The classic formulation was given by St. Irenaeus in the second century when he interpreted the Incarnation as a 'recapitulation', a gathering up of all that had gone before in a new creation, the end of which is to raise man to the level of God.

Here, however, we are dealing with beliefs of a different kind from those which have so far come to our notice. [If any man sees in Christ the supreme incarnation of love and believes that this incarnation is in some sense a key to the enigmas of life and even of the universe, he is making a judgment of value which is quite different from the description of a phenomenon. Such a judgment is not just assent to a proposition but rather commitment to a way of life. Because we have to live and take decisions as well as think and observe, we have all to take risks and make judgments of value in the light of what knowledge we have, though this knowledge may be very incomplete. Teilhard does not imagine that he is proving Christianity true, but he may claim to be showing us that we live in a kind of universe in which it is not unreasonable to make Christ and the love which He manifests matters of ultimate concern.]

We must conclude that as far as the problems of God and religion are concerned, Teilhard has said hardly anything that is new. Huxley is probably quite wrong when he asserts that Teilhard's influence on the world's thinking is bound to be important. It is much more likely that *The Phenomenon of Man* will prove to have as ephemeral a vogue as had Haeckel's *The Riddle of the Universe* sixty years earlier. Huxley is talking much more to the point when he praises Teilhard for his effort to bring together the scientific knowledge and the religious values of our world. For the split between these two has afflicted our culture with a profound sickness, and any one who seeks to heal it is surely deserving of some praise.

¹ In *Man's Vision of God*.

² *The Incarnate Lord*, 255.

The Urgency of Unity¹

BY THE REVEREND KENNETH SLACK, M.B.E., BRITISH COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

'Redeeming the time, because the days are evil.'—Eph 5¹⁶.

'Buy up your opportunities, for these are evil times' (Weymouth).

QUITE suddenly the world has become aware that there is a wind of change moving with increasing force over the diverse churches of Christ in all the world, bringing them into new and closer relationship. This wind—whatever it may understandably owe to the actual events of our time—cannot but be seen by religious men as a breath of the Spirit of God, urgent, disturbing and even vehement.

That this wind has long been blowing discerning Christian men have well known. But it was as the wind of ecclesiastical change caught the vessel of the Archbishop of Canterbury's pilgrimage towards the close of last year that the imagination of the great mass of men in many countries was in its turn caught. There was dramatic symbolism in the way in which, as the Archbishop visited the sacred sites of our most holy religion in Jerusalem and elsewhere, the normal restrictions upon the relationships between divided churches were broken down. The Roman Franciscans who chose to enter the Anglican Cathedral and raise their voices in the solemn *Te Deum* were seen even by many of their co-religionists not as irresponsible violators of sound doctrine and order, but as men bearing a prophetic testimony in that moment to the movement of the Spirit. Thereafter they must return to obedience to the restrictions, but in the Spirit they bore their testimony then to their hope of a day when such acts should not be momentary but the fellowship which they symbolize would be a permanent reality.

And as Dr. Fisher in succession visited the Oecumenical Patriarch and the Pope, representing in their own persons the first of the great schisms which have rent Christ's Church asunder, he showed forth to the world the yearning for fellowship with which God is profoundly disturbing us for our own good and His greater glory.

Surely it would be faithless not to see in such events—and in the warm-hearted utterances of the Patriarch of Moscow as almost simultaneously he visited the Orthodox Churches of Greece and the Near East—some answer to that ever-increasing volume of prayer that Christ may grant to His Church that unity which He wills by such means as He chooses.

¹ Sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on 26th February 1961. The sermon has been shortened.

The great process has just begun whereby members of the one hundred and seventy-eight churches within the World Council of Churches are being drawn into the study, thought, and prayer which will culminate in their chosen representatives gathering next November in the Third Assembly of the Council in New Delhi. At that Assembly it is expected that there will be official observers from both the Roman Catholic Church and the Russian Orthodox Church²—evidences of interest and concern which would have seemed inconceivable from either when the Assembly last met, only seven years ago at Evanston in the United States of America. At that Assembly too, it is probable that the first Pentecostal Church—the Pentecostal Church of Chile—will be admitted into membership, showing that the work of interpretation of this great movement for unity goes on to those new forms of church life which seem to fill up the lack of zeal and missionary fervour in the older communions.

In the light of these events surely the Bishop of Bristol is right when he discerns in this day a '*Kairos*' of unity (the word *Kairos* which stands for 'time' in our text as the Authorised Version translates it). But *Kairos* is never the material measured out by clocks and calendars—but time of a certain sort, critical time, fit time, demanding time. Thus the modern translation catches the meaning more accurately when the Apostle is made to summon us not to 'redeem the time' but to 'buy up our opportunities'. And it is in that conviction that this is a day of time to be redeemed, opportunities to be bought up and seized—that I preach from this word to you. It is a word, of course, in which Paul was speaking of the personal behaviour of the Christian; but it is significant that it comes from the letter in which the essential unity of Christ's Church is a central theme. Earlier in this very letter comes the greatest of the expositions in the epistles of the oneness of all Christ's followers. '... called in one hope . . .' possessing 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism'. And it is again significant that that very passage is a development of the theme of our walking worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called. Far from the Apostle regarding

² Since the sermon was preached this Church has applied for full membership of the World Council.

Christian unity as just an ecclesiastical matter—using the word ‘ecclesiastical’ in our pejorative way which is all too grim a reflection of our inadequate doctrine of the Church—he sees it as indissolubly bound up with the way in which the Christian life is lived by members of Christ’s body, and the Christian mission fulfilled by those whom Christ has called.

It is therefore not a perverse ingenuity that seeks to apply these words about the significant moment to the theme of Christian unity. A word addressed to the Christian member may rightly be seen as a word addressed to the whole Christian fellowship. What then does this word of God say to us?

I.

The first thing that strikes us is the strange reason given for the need for resolute right action. It is ‘because the days are evil’. At first glance this is an odd reason. Yet possibly one commentator gives us the clue when he guesses this to be a trader’s proverb. Not when everything is going smoothly does the trader have to be watchful for the opportunity to be seized. At a time like that the most inept people make a competence. But then the economy changes, and such all too easily won prosperity melts away. Then it is the man who is on the look-out for every opportunity of doing profitable trade, and who runs the necessary risks on the basis of his knowledge and shrewdness, who alone can expect to prosper.

If indeed it is a proverb borrowed from the market-place that the Apostle uses, he is following an example set constantly by our Lord. Jesus was ready to commend the unjust steward who made friends for the future by giving a high discount on the debts to his master before facing unemployment. Jesus often must have shocked those who felt themselves to be more spiritually minded by such plain advice as He gave that the people who are at home in this tough world have more sense than a lot of religious people—for so we are surely to understand the words about the children of this world being wiser in their generation than the children of light.

And has it not proved true again and again in Christian history that the daring Christian who showed the same shrewd calculation of worthwhile risks as the able business man has bought up the significant moment just when the days were evil? The classic instance in English history is, of course, the work of John Wesley. What a time—as has often been remarked—to expect a greater evangelical outpouring than we have seen before or since!

In one sense ours is the darkest day in which man has ever been called to live. No previous

generation has lived in a day so evil that a few moments of time, and the wilfulness or even careless error of a few men, could lead to the annihilation of civilisation as we have known it. It says much for the resilience of the human mind and spirit that we seem able to live at least with tolerable content in such a situation. But this threat of final evil and darkness is only the grimmest manifestation of the evil of our riven world. Great divisions there have been in the past—between the Roman Empire and the barbarism without, between the opposed blocs of powers in the two wars of this century. But ‘the great divide’ of our day between East and West has a seeming finality that causes reflection on it to daunt the spirit. There seems at times no possible basis for any dialogue or discourse between us.

The days are evil, indeed. In that wry sense, at least, our text is not irrelevant.

II.

But the second thing this word says to us is that in such days the *Kairos* comes with a compelling urgency. If there be indeed a *Kairos* of unity to-day our response to it is a matter of desperate urgency. Such redeemable moments of time do not recur like the hours with which the ordinary stuff of time is measured out. *Kairos* is not *Chronos*. There will be an eight o’clock to-morrow to catch the train that goes daily at that hour; but the significant moment may have passed for ever. It was perhaps *Kairos* which Shakespeare for all his ‘less Greek’ had in mind when he wrote:

For time is like a fashionable host,
That slightly shakes his parting guest by the hand,
And with his arms outstretch’d, as he would fly,
Grasps in the comer.

And the blunt fact of the matter is that in regard to Christian unity we will not recognize that the time of opportunity may not be with us for ever. It is almost fifty-one years since in Edinburgh there gathered that World Missionary Conference from which so much of the modern ecumenical movement sprang. When Christian leaders came from all over the world last summer to give God thanks there for what He has wrought since that day—we had not one single union which transcends denominational barriers to show them in the island where it all began. Early in his Primacy Dr. Fisher made the whole issue challengingly alive. But, as his Primacy comes to its close, how little of eagerness has been shown by either Anglican or non-Anglican churches.

What is lacking is the sense of urgency. Our defensive motto is ‘the time is not ripe’. But

suppose this is not the kind of time that ripens, but rather the kind that passes, never to return? Even if we cling to the thought of the time not being ripe, what do we imagine is going to ripen time for unity?

Again and again we hear the cry raised—or perhaps rather a deprecatory murmur gently rebuking some of us urgent spirits—‘We must not try to by-pass the great theological task that must be done before union can come’. And then we find again and again that the tasks which are proposed bear a suspicious resemblance to those tackled in the Conversations which forty years ago followed the Lambeth Appeal of 1920. And the question arises whether we are short not of theological toil but of readiness for costly obedience.

When the urgency of the situation is pressed the Anglican and the Free Churchman often have different defences. The Anglican emphasises that truth is as important as unity, and possibly fears that any union with non-episcopal churches may hinder eventual union with the Roman Catholic Church. Of this I would just ask two questions. One is whether it is sufficiently recognized that unity is a quite central part of the truth about Christ and His Church—and that it may only be as we take the plunge that we shall know more of the truth about Christ and His Church. The other is whether the Roman Catholic Church will take the non-Roman churches seriously until their recognition of the essential unity of Christ’s Church is at least strong enough to compel union between them. There is this small evidence to support this view—that even the degree of unity which the World Council of Churches has increasingly shown has caused a change in the Roman Catholic attitude to the ecumenical movement. The encyclical *Mortalium Animos* of 1928 took a wholly negative view, but since last year there has existed in the Vatican Secretariat for Unity an official channel for communication with it—and official observers have attended the meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council. What was formerly dismissed as mere co-operation on, for example, social questions, is recognized as a truly religious movement worthy of profound study such as not a few Roman Catholic scholars are giving to it.

The Free Churchman’s characteristic defence is different. Regarding union with the Church of England he is tempted to say that the barrier is on the Anglican side, with that demand for an episcopally ordained ministry which has dominated Anglicanism since the Tractarians. I do not minimize the problem—for I am myself an English Presbyterian, and therefore a Free Churchman. But to this is often linked the assertion that if

only the Anglicans would grant full and immediate intercommunion union would rapidly result. But is this honestly true? Can the Anglican not frankly reply that it does not seem to have happened thus between the English Free Churches themselves, which have had almost full intercommunion for decades, and are not one whit nearer organic union. Sometimes reluctance to embark on Free Church union is justified by the fear lest it should retard union with the Church of England. But is it seriously maintained that it is this which causes the Free Churches manfully to restrain themselves from a union among themselves on which they are otherwise ready to embark?

III.

What will make us feel the necessary urgency to break through our caution and our defences? It is just because this world is so appallingly divided that it must be given an unmistakable demonstration of the power of Christ to give unity. In a day when the walls of partition—whether they be of iron or bamboo, or of apartheid enactments—rise higher and higher, only a showing forth in that which claims to be His body of Christ’s power to break them down and make men one can be sufficient. And the need is immediate.

And it is because so many churches all over the world look to the British churches as mother churches that there is a particular urgency attending the relations of the churches here. The whole Anglican communion, the worldwide fellowship of Methodism, the Congregational churches wherever they are found—all owe their origin to religious movements in this land. Of new forms of churchmanship England has ever been a fertile mother. To-day can the same country be used to bring the churches into a new and fruitful unity?

Nor is it different if we think of the religious condition of our land itself. We surely deceive ourselves if we pretend that in any serious degree the churches are organized for mission. There is far too much effort being wasted on maintaining an ecclesiastical set-up that caters for the religious tastes and predilections of the small church-going minority, and far too little drastic re-ordering of our resources and ways to try to get to grips with a generation in which the great mass is wholly alienated from the Church and its gospel. Not only if we look right out to the divided world in which we live, but also if we look at our neighbours we shall see the monstrous irrelevance of our divisions—and the way they deny the reconciling gospel here are called to proclaim.

It is because we are the days *are* evil that the time for

action about unity has come. We need to be zealous in study; we need to be open in mind; we need to be constant in prayer. But—possibly above all—we need to be urgent and obedient in

action, letting no significant opportunity pass—eager to redeem this time, that we be ourselves redeemed and made fit to be used for the world's redemption.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

The Same—Only Different

BY H. F. MATHEWS, M.A., PH.D.,
KIDDERMINSTER

'There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit.'—
1 Co 12⁴.

I WANT you to make an imaginary collection of things. Set them out (will you?) on a make-believe tray. Start off with a lump of coal and a piece of chalk. Add a stick of charcoal—the stuff you use in the art lesson. If you can borrow one of those squashy tubes of fuel your father uses to fill his lighter, put that on as well. Now add a lead pencil. You have borrowed something from Dad; so try something from Mum: it's her diamond ring you want! (But don't be surprised if she won't lend it!).

Now these scientist chaps, for whom we all have such a proper admiration in these brave days, tell us that all the things on our tray are nearly alike. They look different enough to us, because we are not scientists. The man who knows his chemistry looks upon them all as carbon.

In fact, the scientist will say that your lead pencil and the diamond in your mother's ring are chemically identical. The pencil is made of graphite—almost pure carbon. So is the diamond. But the graphite is black and opaque, whereas the diamond is colourless and transparent. The diamond is the hardest of known substances, yet the graphite is one of the softest minerals. The graphite is a good conductor of electricity, the diamond a very bad one. The one is greasy to the touch, the other smooth and clean. And so on. These physical differences are what we see. The scientist is mainly interested in the real identity between the two substances.

Let's forget things for a moment and think about persons. Jesus underlined the fact that in a great and glorious way we are all identical. We are all sons of God made in His own image. And Paul taught the Corinthians that the different parts of the 'body' (his term for Christ's followers) have no precedence.

That makes our flaunted differences seem quite silly. Why, some people worry about the fact

that they belong to different classes in society: you know, they say, 'Fancy playing with him! He comes from the estate'. The sorriest difference we underline in some parts of the world to-day is the colour of our skins. The fact that one man has a brown skin doesn't make him any different from us in the sight of God: it is only what the scientist would call a physical difference.

They were a bit worried in a school I heard about recently because a new girl came to one of the infant classes. She would be the only coloured girl in the school, and the teachers just wondered whether she would be treated differently. But all was well. For one morning at 'break' there came a frantic six-year-old to the staff-room door. 'Please miss', she squeaked, 'come quick! A little girl has fallen and hurt herself. It's the little girl with the pink frock.'

Thank goodness she didn't say, 'the little black girl', as they might have done in some parts of the world. We all wear different coloured clothes. Six-year-old had noticed that, but otherwise had gained a new friend. And the teachers were relieved, because the grazed knee the new girl got would be less painful than the thought that people regarded her as 'different'.

Booker Washington, a great negro teacher, used to hold up his outstretched hand and say that in some ways we are as separate as the fingers. Then he would clench his fist and add, 'But in all essential things we are one as the hand'.

The important thing is that we should be genuine, through and through—pure element without alloy. God has a purpose for both lead pencil and precious diamond.

No Guests for a King

BY THE REVEREND J. A. DEAN, B.A., B.D.,
BRAMHALL

'Come; for all things are now ready.'—Lk 14¹⁷.

In Austria, there is a marvellous building known as Linderhof Castle. It was a residence of a very eccentric Emperor called Ludwig. The castle is situated in an isolated spot, hedged by densely-packed trees. Inside the gates are lovely terraced

gardens with flowers and plants; shrubs and bushes of all varieties, and dotted all over the gardens are gaily-coloured peacocks. Facing the main entrance door of the castle is an artificial cataract of water, splashing its way down about a hundred broad steps, and feeding a gorgeous fountain that shoots the water seventy feet in the air. There are also wonderful caves, that remind you of *The Arabian Nights* with Aladdin and his lamp. It was in these caves that Wagner, a friend of Ludwig, used to practise his operas. Inside the castle, there are exquisite paintings and tapestries, carpets and antique furniture, clocks and glistening chandeliers.

As you go through the castle, you come at last to the Audience-room of the Emperor. This was a very special room, for here Ludwig was to meet all kinds of important people—kings and queens, nobles and ladies, ambassadors and diplomats. Yet Ludwig never received an audience. Fancy having an Audience-room, specially furnished, and then never receiving an audience. I told you that Ludwig was eccentric. After passing through the Audience-room you come to the dining-room. In here there is a lovely dining-room table. The floor and table are so made that it is possible to lower the table through the floor into the kitchen below. There the cook filled it with good things and sent the food back, piping hot. Yet the remarkable thing is that Ludwig always ate alone. He never invited any guests to dinner.

As Christians, we have a King whose name is Jesus. He likes to have around Him people from every corner of the earth. He has an Audience-room and He is more than anxious that we should go and meet with Him. We can talk to Him any time we like. In fact, He wants us to tell Him about our joys and share with Him our sorrows. We can confess to Him the things we have done wrong, and receive the King's pardon. Further, our King bids us dine with Him at His Table. We call this the Communion of the Lord's Supper, and all who love Jesus are welcome. He sends each one of us a personal invitation, with the words, 'Come, for all things are now ready'.

Ludwig had an Audience-room but no audience; a dining-room but no guests. Jesus has an Audience-room crowded daily with those who pray, and an Upper-room that is not only furnished and prepared, but where He loves to dine with people of all nations who have responded to His royal invitation: 'Come, for all things are now ready'.

under the Thames' 'from Waterloo Station to the Bank' but from the platform of the Bank Station on the Waterloo and City Line to the Main Bank Underground Station.—*Editor*.

The Christian Year

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Spiritual Insight

BY THE REVEREND H. A. HAMILTON, B.A.,
BRIGHTON

'He endured, as seeing him who is invisible.'—He
II²⁷.

What is the secret of endurance in the Christian life? Every man needs to know it, whether for him endurance is bearing, or persevering; it may mean both. Enduring tribulation, chastening, or grief, is at some time or other the lot of every man; each has to learn to take his share of hardness. But more commonly, and certainly more continuously, we know the need to endure as those who must maintain the spiritual glow; who must continue in their calling; who must follow on to know.

This magnificent text suggests that the answer to our need is neither a stoic fortitude nor a girded will, but a way of looking so as to see. It might be no more than a fine phrase were it not a recapitulation of the dominant theme of a glorious symphonic movement through the length of the chapter, with its song of men going out with the light of a new country in their eyes or men journeying toward the city of God. The theme, indeed, echoes the musical language of Old Testament seer and prophet and catches up again the strain of praise of a Lord 'who for the joy set before him endured the cross'.

Faith is not primarily an act of reason or an act of will; it is more even than reason plus will. Faith is a sustained way of looking at events or at men so as to see the invisible. As we try to see with a sustained and disciplined imagination, both reason and will have their place, but the essence of both is the power to see: to see, free from the veil of familiarity or the distortion of theory; to see things as they are so as to see through them and beyond them. What we see may be a point of arrest or a point of departure. We may turn back upon ourselves from the things seen and allow the processes of reason to begin; we identify, we make judgments, find cause to argue. Or, we may move through the things seen or heard so as to find something coming through to us from the other side. The art of Christian life is to learn how always to see the Personal pressing in from the other side of the appearance

Erratum

The Trav-o-lator (Virginibus Puerisque, June, 1961, p. 280). The Trav-o-lator does not 'run

of things. This is what was made supremely possible for us in the Incarnation.

Remembering the stable, where for once in our lives

Everything became a You and nothing was an It.

To us who can only think of God in images and only know Him on the other side of the images in which we think of Him—to us was given the perfect Image—'The express image of his person'. To endure is to learn how to see Him coming invisibly from the other side of what is seen.

Instead, how often He becomes a point of arrest. We turn back upon ourselves into thought about Him; into doctrines about Him; even arguments about Him. Meanwhile, out of the invisible, He knocks unheard and unseen on the door of the visible.

We have retreated inwards to our minds too much

Have made rooms there with all doors closed
All windows shuttered.

To endure is to see; *instead*, how often we return from what we see to the resources of our own wills and ask for one more effort: 'I must try harder'. All the world, like children in their school reports, seem to believe 'He can do better if he tries harder'. Like the child, our trouble is that we have never really *seen* what it is we are trying to do.

This glorious text is calling us out of this kind of strenuous effort to try instead to learn to look for Him coming from the other side. Perhaps, indeed, the cause of many of our practical difficulties is that we have misdirected our effort; we have tried too hard to do His will and not hard enough to see Him. The difference is immeasurable. Once we can see Him coming from the other side of life's mingled good and ill and know that He is to be found in each changing experience, how differently we face it. When we see temptation not as the scene of a tremendous moral battle in which we are regularly worsted, but as the place where most of all He can be seen coming to stand by our side, how much more easily the enemy is put to flight. Said Temple Gairdner, a missionary of vision and courage (how often they go together!), 'I must find a handhold on the other side of events'. This is it; to believe some thing or someone is on the other side and can be seen there and known and held there—this is the secret of endurance. Paul put it 'I lay hold of Him who has laid hold of me'.

Probably most of us need much more than we do to exercise our imagination as we read the Gospels, and to see Him who is invisible looking back at us through the pages. 'Look at Him

until you find Him looking back at you', said a wise saint. So to learn to see His image through the window of the gospel as He comes across the turbulent sea, that we wait quietly for Him to come into the little unsteady vessel of our lives; so to see the image of Him coming out of His place of scourging and looking upon the betraying Peter, that we see Him looking upon us from the other side of our failures. Indeed, His very invisibility becomes faith's opportunity, if we remember that the beginning always is readiness to see.

So this text calls us not to sharpen the edge of our wills; it calls us to exercise the inner eye, to emerge from the imaginative idleness which is the ultimate source of death in the soul. If there is to be a revival of religion in this land, there must be a renewal of imagination. Nothing is more important in the training of Christian persons than the training of a Christian imagination. This needs to find its place in our work with children and young people and, even more, to be the character of our own private prayer.

We can form this joyful habit of mind, in which we expect to see Him coming through the visible. This habit grows by the practice of looking behind the words and between the lines, until the living Word comes to greet us. We fashion this habit as we practise the way of recollecting the experience until we know how to see it with Him and hear what He is saying to us. In short the Christian life does not consist in holding resolutely to a pattern of ideas or obeying strongly an ideal of living; the heart of it is the willingness to lay hold, through our imagination, of Him who through the invisible has come, and still comes, to lay hold of us. In that faith alone we can endure.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Harvest Thanksgiving

BY THE REVEREND R. LEONARD SMALL, O.B.E.,
D.D., EDINBURGH

'So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; And should sleep, and rise night and day.'—Mk 4^{28, 29}.

Surely a Harvest Thanksgiving Service is a complete anachronism to-day. How far would the members of the average congregation have to go to see a stack of wheat; where could they watch the harvest 'safely, safely gathered in'? What with combine harvesters and sliced wrapped bread a host of modern techniques and complicated processes stand between us and the original meaning of this festival. Should we not be realistic and just give it up? That would surely be a pity, and we should be losing something not

only relevant but vital. In this parable in miniature of the seed growing secretly Jesus takes the processes of growth which lie behind any harvest, holds them up to the light of God, as we to-day might hold up to the light a colour-snap taken on holiday, and uses them to reveal God's works and ways.

1. *Harvest Thanksgiving is a reminder of our ultimate dependence on God*, in all things. The seed growing secretly lays the emphasis on that part of the process of growth that is not in our human hands. The farmer's helplessness to 'take over' from God is underlined in the phrase 'sleep and rise'. It is very tempting for modern man to look at the processes of Nature which he has so largely learned to use and control and say of the results: 'All my own work'. Yet there remain facts in the situation the realization of any one of which would prick this bubble of self-esteem. We can split the atom, we can put a man into orbit, but we cannot make rain. If we could hire some scientist to do this one thing, on an appreciable scale, what problems would be solved! We can only take and use what is given. The Old Testament carries this lesson much wider than the processes of growth, and talks about the minerals hidden in the hills, all the raw materials without which there could be none of this human achievement. All the way from his primitive stone-age club to uranium man has only taken and used what was there. All the way from the fundamental invention of the wheel to the latest achievement of nuclear fissure he has merely harnessed possibilities that were there. The oil that is the life blood of commerce and communications—man only tapped the resources that were there. What is more—and this we all too often forget—we have been able to do all of these things only by using the minds, the hands, the powers God gave us. The one thing we cannot counterfeit, or prefabricate, or produce by synthetic methods is life.

Harvest Thanksgiving always has a further spiritual message. Here is a message for parents, teachers, youth workers who strive to grow character, to produce fine personality, often in a most unfriendly climate. They can plant and water, but only God can give the increase. Many earnest people are deeply concerned to make and keep the life of the Church vital. To them Christ still says: 'Without me ye can do nothing'. Not least there is our own personal life, where we pray and strive to be better men and women. For us R. L. Stevenson's words ring true: 'There is nothing but the grace of God; we walk on it, we breathe it in; it is the nails and rivets of the universe'.

2. At the same time *Harvest Thanksgiving is a*

challenge to us, literally in every field of life, *to co-operate with God*. The farmer in the parable has his part to play; it may seem very little to cast the seed into the ground, but he has first ploughed and cultivated the land, and, come harvest, there is much he must do. Harvest Thanksgiving in the modern world does us a double service. It is a rebuke to a sort of haughty and truculent independence that is all too common—the attitude of the man who takes his broad acres, the business he has built up, and says of it all: 'This is mine to do with as I will; I am answerable to no one'. But it also offers to modern man a wonderful new incentive. What an incentive it must have been to be allowed to help R. J. Mitchell to design and perfect the Spitfire, or Fleming to produce penicillin, or the Cambridge physicists to split the atom, or Hunt to prepare for the conquest of Everest. We are here, each and every one of us, to help God to get things done. Doing the will of God simply means getting done what God wants done. So the farmer must produce the most he can, and the best he can, in a hungry and needy world, not because good farming pays, but because, when he makes the most and best of his land, he is co-operating best with God. Whether he realizes it or not, that is what he is there for.

This principle of co-operating with God is capable of the widest application. One very obvious instance is the wide ministry of healing. In a ward of the Deaconess Hospital in Edinburgh (founded and long maintained as a Church Hospital) these words are printed and framed:

The Twenty-fourth Psalm in the Hospital:

'The hospital is the Lord's,
And the operating-rooms thereof,
The wards and they that dwell therein;
For He hath founded it in loving-kindness
And established it on the mercy of Christ.
Who shall ascend into the hill of health?
Who shall serve in the holy place of healing?
He whose hands have been made surgically
clean,
And in whose heart is the pure love of truth;
She who hath lifted up her heart unto service
And dedicated her life unto the ministry of
healing.
These shall receive the blessing.
They shall receive honours from the Lord,
They shall receive affection from all mankind.'

Fellow-workers with God—indeed. This obvious example stresses the further point that we have no right to pull less than our full weight in the tasks we share with Him. This is very true of our actual daily tasks whatever they may be, but it is also searchingly applicable to the life of

the Church. There is nothing particularly religious or sacred about a muddle! Why must we make a fetish of old and often shabby ways of doing things, such as we would never accept in trade, or business, or profession? Do it the best way it can be done, for in this, in a very special way we are fellow-workers with God. Not least important, this principle must be applied in the realm of personal living. We are here to get done what God wants done, in us, and for us, and through us, and nothing less than our best will do.

3. *Harvest Thanksgiving proclaims the certainty of harvest*, it declares a great hope built on the faithfulness of God. The climax of the parable arrives when the farmer putteth in the sickle for the harvest is come. This heartening assumption runs through the New Testament; Jesus facing death and defeat, yet declaring: 'I, if I be lifted up . . . will draw all men unto me'; Paul at the end of that great challenge to the Last Enemy crying: 'Be ye stedfast . . . forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord'; the Book itself ending with a great vision of the New Jerusalem; the whole of our faith looks forward to the harvest which is bound to come since God is God. That does not mean there will never be disappointments. But the law is written: 'Seedtime and harvest shall not fail'. We stand in grave need of some great hope for the world. Current events shake our faith and pose the question: 'What is it all coming to?' This old, seemingly out-dated Festival supplies a positive answer. The hopes and fears of all the years that have loved and served Christ's Church will not be in vain, there will be a harvest of new vitality and obedience and fruitfulness. In our own lives the fruits of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, and the rest will grow. A woman missionary who had given a life-time of service to China had to listen recently to the condolences of a well-meaning friend who remarked how sad it was to think of all the fruits of so much loving and sacrificial service offered so long by so many being so tragically wasted now that China was Communist-dominated. Quite quietly she replied: 'I have enough faith left to believe that no service sincerely and lovingly offered in Christ's name is ever wasted. There will be a harvest.'

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

3. Judgment on the Nation

BY THE REVEREND DOUGLAS STEWART, M.A.,
LONDON

'Now in the morning as he returned into the city, he hungered. And when he saw a fig tree in the way, he

came to it, and found nothing thereon, but leaves only; and said unto it, Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever. And presently the fig tree withered away.'—Mt 21¹⁸⁻¹⁹.

I must have been about fifteen years old at the time. It was a Friday afternoon in school and we were having a Scripture lesson. Our mood of devout thoughtlessness was shattered by a boy who suddenly declared, 'Sir, I don't believe that story!' The story was the cursing of the fig tree.

The experience was alarming because, I expect it was for some of us the smashing of the egg-shell of childhood's faith and our emergence into the world of scepticism. How could any one say, 'I don't believe that story' when there it was, 'in the Bible'?

The truth is that in our preaching we have a tendency to praise faith—any kind of faith. And we have a tendency to denounce scepticism—any kind of scepticism. But there are exercises of faith which shut us off forever from the truth and there are sceptical attitudes which are the growing of both mind and soul. Take the youthful sceptic who 'didn't believe' in the cursing of the fig tree. He was, in effect, saying, 'I believe in Christ and I can't believe therefore that He ever did anything so senseless, perhaps even so cruel, as to curse a tree because it didn't bear fruit out of season.' He alone of us all was stirred by his faith into denial. Until we ask his question we cannot grasp this story.

The cursing of the fig tree occurs in the Gospel as part of the complex of events surrounding the triumphal entry. And like the triumphal entry it is an acted parable. 'The Kingdom is Come' was His message in the triumphal entry and the cursing of the tree is the judgment of the Kingdom.

Both John the Baptist and Jesus had used this sign in their spoken parables. 'Now is the axe laid to the root of the trees.' But in the decisive hour, as He had ridden dramatically into Jerusalem to show that the Kingdom was come, He enacted the rejection of Israel. 'No man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever.'

St. Luke omits this incident but at the same point in his Gospel he inserts Christ's prophecy of the destruction of the city. 'And they shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee: . . . because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation.'

In that hour of crisis there is a double rejection. We are conscious of the rejection of Christ, before the High Priest, before Herod, before Pilate. But this is not the significant rejection. The significant rejection is the rejection by Christ of the High Priest, of Herod, and of Pilate, a rejection emphasized by His silences.

Annas and Caiaphas, Herod and Pilate, were

unaware of the magnitude of the events in which they were involved. They were all prisoners of their ideologies and deceived as to the relative importance of men and of events. Annas and Caiaphas were blinded by their devotion to their religion and people. The Jewish people and the Jewish faith were, they felt, entrusted to them, to be defended in the difficult circumstances of defeat and occupation. The great leviathan of Rome had swallowed the prophetic nation. At all costs it must be prevented from digesting it, from assimilating it to its own being. They saw it as a national and religious duty to defend their integrity. Herod and Pilate were blinded by their devotion to 'the manifest destiny' of Rome. All conquering peoples feel their responsibility to bestow the blessings of unity, order, peace, and justice on mankind. Nationalists of every sort are seen by them as backward-looking, reactionary, sectarian, standing in the way of the onward march of history.

The coming of God's Kingdom was outside the calculations of both parties. They were therefore only aware of it as a problem, an obstacle to their plans, something to be got rid of in order that the real struggle might be resumed. Jesus was a passing irritant, at best a pawn to be used in their game of power politics.

It is interesting to see that the reversal of rôles was understood by, of all peoples, Spengler.

'But when Jesus was taken before Pilate then the world of facts and the world of truths were face to face in immediate and implacable hostility. It is a scene appallingly distinct and overwhelming in its symbolism, such as the world's history had never before and has never since looked at. . . . In one world, the historic, the Roman caused the Galilean to be crucified—that was His Destiny. In the other world, Rome was cast for perdition, and the Cross became the pledge of Redemption—that was "the will of God".'

The point at issue here is that the Kingdom is come. Christ is risen. You cannot prevent the rise of this tide and all nations, all races, all politicians, statesmen, leaders must take account of it. It is not possible, living as we do between D-day and V-day, to hold back the forces of the Kingdom.

When men say despairingly, 'Where are the signs of His coming?' it is because of secular blindness, for there are two assertions we can safely make about the Kingdom of God. In the Kingdom it is unthinkable that some shall be rich and secure while others are impoverished and starving. In the Kingdom it is unthinkable that one race shall be deemed superior to the others. All men are equally the children of God. For all men equally Christ died. To all races is the Spirit given.

Behind every political and economic crisis of our time there lie these two inescapable factors. We are involved, as Mr Khrushchev has said, in world revolution. The poverty-stricken and the dispossessed areas of the world, Asia, and Latin America, are on the march. The racially depressed continent of the Africans is awakening. The effects of this are experienced by us in Western Europe and America as a series of crises and shocks. We cry out that we are standing for international order, for peace, for justice, for liberty of the subject. We protest that those who are against us are anti-God. But behind the local and temporal revolutions there is the pressure of the Kingdom. And the West seems curiously cast in the rôle of standing against the Kingdom, opposing the economic aspirations of Asia and the racial aspirations of Africa. At times our Communist opponents seem to be closer to a Christian understanding of contemporary history than we are.

Christ is risen. Christ is in the world. The leaven of the Kingdom disturbs the dough of our secular existence. His life cannot be destroyed nor His Kingdom prevented. But we may be so preoccupied with the defence of our lesser aims and loyalties that we become fruitless trees, 'It is good for nothing, but to be cut down and cast into the fire'.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Glory to God

BY THE REVEREND KENNETH G. GRANT, A.R.C.M.,
THE RECTORY, CHARFIELD, WOTTON-UNDER-EDGE

'And lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them, and serve them, which the Lord thy God hath divided unto all nations under the whole heaven.'—Dt 4¹⁹.

The twelfth of April 1961, is a momentous day in the history of man's conquest of the universe. On this day a human being went, for the first time, into space; swept around the earth at fifteen thousand miles an hour; experienced the sensation of weightlessness in his space-machine. It is a wonderful achievement. Even if we do not share the world-view of the country whose achievement it is, we must give credit where credit is due.

Someone who has been out of the world in this way would never be quite the same again. I do not infer that he would be injured in any way but that his mental outlook would be extended in a

way that it is only possible for us earth-bound humans to imagine. One who has travelled round the world visiting the great historic landmarks would return home with a new attitude to his own familiar surroundings. One who has been circling the earth and seeing it as a distant object would return, one imagines, feeling that the world was a comparatively tiny place and the whole of mankind—whatever their beliefs—one family, a comparatively cosy community. We already believe, of course, that mankind is a family. But an experience like this would tend to impress this on the mind in a new manner. Any venture which can teach the peoples of the world such a truth is of great spiritual value. May God help us to use it in this way.

A new 'pop' song was born in April. It is a Russian one and, as one would expect, its theme is man's new conquest of space. What all the words are I do not know. We have been told that the chorus begins, 'Glory, glory'. One cannot help remembering an old American song, singing the praises of another hero, the chorus of which began, 'Glory, glory, hallelujah'. No doubt you remember the war-march of John Brown, whose soul goes marching on, although his body is in the grave.

It is interesting, and significant, that the chorus of the new Russian space-song stops short at the words, 'Glory, glory'. There is no hallelujah. After all, hallelujah means, Glory be to Jehovah—but we ought to remember that there are many people who think of themselves as Christians who do not give glory to God for the great and wonderful things that happen.

When the Russians sing, 'Glory, glory', they are thinking of the glorious achievements of man, and in particular of Communist man. Their refrain has implicit within it, Glory be to man on earth, and now, Glory be to man beyond earth; Glory be to the achievements of the great Russian people; Glory be to the Communist way of life which makes such achievements possible. And every victory they have, every step that they take ahead of the rest of the world, confirms their belief in their own way of life and its eventual spread throughout the world.

Though we do not agree with the Communist philosophy there are still lessons to be learned from the Russian achievement. Their present achievement is, clearly, the result of the sacrifice of the whole people. It is true that it is a sacrifice dictated to them from above, though that does not mean to say it is entirely without their consent. But when achievement comes as a result of sacrifice, the whole nation is drawn together in

the rejoicing that follows because they feel that they have all shared in it.

That feeling was very strong in our country at the end of the last War. Is it as strong to-day? I think that we must sadly agree that it is not. We are faced with grasping groups—the demand for MORE—and although one can exempt certain individuals from this grasping spirit, one cannot acquit any particular level of our society. This unending spiral of demand is expressed in such familiar fashion as 'We must maintain our standard of living'; 'We have a right to share in the increased prosperity of the nation'; or, more nakedly avaricious, 'Why shouldn't we have what *they* are getting?' One must not lose sight of 'social justice', but even that expression can become a euphemism for self-interest.

No society can prosper if it is more anxious to grasp than to give, although it may appear to do so for a time. It is ALWAYS joint sacrifice that binds a family, a nation, or a church together. As members of the Church we are given the chance to display this truth to the world. Perhaps too often we think of our own material prosperity and standard of living (failing to see that it is only high materially) as the ultimate aim of life. We will not curb our desires and sacrifice ourselves for a cause. Voluntary sacrifice would be a greater gesture than imposed sacrifice. The Russian example should jolt us into greater achievement, though in a different realm.

It would be niggardly to deny the greatness of the space-venture achievement. But it would be un-Christian if we failed to see it in its proper perspective. On the day of the space-flight, the first lesson for Evensong in the Anglican table of lessons contained a significant verse—'Lest thou lift up thine eyes unto the heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them, and serve them . . .' (Dt 4¹⁹). This realistic reminder comes to us from the distant past. It is idolatry to worship the power, the glory, the loveliness of the earth, the moon, the sun, and the stars. It is no less idolatry to worship the scientific and technical brilliance by which man reaches out towards these heavenly objects.

Man no longer cries for the moon. Now he plans to climb into his space-machine and GO there. As our minds spin after him, admiring his great achievement, we must remember, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve'. Admiration at human achievement is natural and proper. 'Glory, glory'; but let us not forget to add, Hallelujah—Glory be to God.

Contributions and Comments

Man as a Soul

No one will challenge the preliminary contentions of Dr. Laurin's article (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxxii. [February, 1961]). Biblical study has indeed shown that dichotomous and trichotomous notions of man are foreign to the Hebrew mind. The soul is not a spiritual and immortal principle that enters the body at birth and leaves it at death, because man is regarded as a unity. Man is spirit, soul, body, flesh, etc., all bound up together. No constituent element is capable of supporting life on its own. The conclusions drawn by Dr. Laurin are, however, open to question, and none more so than the curious and ambiguous statement that *man is a soul*. Dr. Laurin bases this statement on the fact that *nephesh* is often used to represent the complete individual, and also on the exegesis of Gn 2⁷. But several constituent elements in man are used to represent the complete individual, and the reason for this is that many physical parts were thought to possess psychical functions, and, man being a unity, those psychical functions must be the experience of the whole person. Thus it is not only the soul that is distressed but the spirit (Gn 26³⁵, Job 7¹¹), the flesh (2 Co 7⁵), the heart (1 S 1⁸), and the bones (Hab 3¹⁶). In each case the grief is the grief of the whole person, and the part of man chosen to represent the whole person is the part that appears most prominent in the experience. So man is portrayed under five different aspects, but in each case it is the whole man that experiences and not just the flesh, heart, or bones. *Nephesh* is thus just one of a dozen words that represent both a constituent element in man and an aspect of his whole person. As the distinction between the physical and the metaphysical did not exist in Bible days, none of these terms has an *a priori* claim to be regarded as primary.¹ The highest spiritual activity can be associated with the physical organs (Ps 9¹ 13⁵ 84²) and the commonest appetites with the soul (Nu 21⁵, Job 6⁷). The singularity of *nephesh* arises from the fact that there are physical organs to correspond with heart and bones but none apparently to correspond with *nephesh*. A firm connexion, however, is established between soul and blood (Gn 9⁴, Lv 17^{11, 14}, Dt 12²³) because the shedding of one means the departure of the other.

¹ *Ruach* should, perhaps, be treated separately because it is not really a constituent element in man, but that does not affect this argument.

Nephesh, therefore, when it is not referring to the whole person, means nothing more than the animal vitality that first came upon man in Gn 2⁷ and that distinguishes the living from the dead. Examples of this basic use are Gn 1²⁰ 37²¹, Ps 124⁷, Pr 12¹⁰. It is in no way surprising that it is used of animals. *Nephesh*, therefore, does not have the special function of representing the 'body-spirit unity' except in the sense that all the terms for the constituent elements in man represent it. Consequently it is misleading to say that man is a soul.

It follows that the Old Testament conception of man as a soul is not the starting point for a discussion of eternal life. Indeed, it is the *unimportance* of *nephesh* that is really significant for Christian belief. Dr. Laurin, however, argues from his contention that death begins a period of 'nakedness', that is to say, bodiless existence (but in the presence of Christ as far as Christians are concerned) which is fulfilled at the final resurrection when, the body being restored, man achieves his ultimate destiny 'in an earthly locale'. There is no doubt whatever that the New Testament teaches resurrection and not Platonic immortality, but an intermediate state of nakedness and a final earthly existence are no part of this doctrine. When the historic Resurrection took place, fact had outrun speculation. The crude, inter-testamental account of Sheol followed by a grand resurrection of the just and an eternal banquet on Mount Zion was quite inadequate to express the Christian hope. Platonic notions, with their false emphases, would have been even more inadequate, even if they had been understood. Paul's task, therefore, was to present the Christian hope in Jewish terms though he knew well that the facts were greater than the terms. This accounts for his inconsistency. This accounts for Ph 1²³ where the vivid reality of the ultimate fellowship with Christ banishes from his mind the intervening period that Jewish expectation required. The word 'soul', far from determining his thought, is hardly to be found in Paul's letters.² By the sovereign, redemptive act of God, and not by virtue of his human nature, man will be recreated. The *σῶμα πνευματικόν* is a body empowered by the Spirit and suitable for life in the world of the Spirit as the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* is suitable for life in this world. Thus we can fully agree with Dr. Laurin's final paragraph.

² The word occurs thirteen times and is never significant for the destiny of man.

God created man entire. In his entirety he must be saved, and in his entirety he will enter the life of heaven.

W. DAVID STACEY

Queen's College, Taunton

'The Faith-Ladder': A Footnote

I SHOULD like to be allowed to thank the Rev. Bernard E. Jones for the way in which he treats my autobiographical book, *One Man's Mind*.

Perhaps, however, I might be allowed to point out that my name is 'Rowland', not 'Rowlands'—a minor detail; but one which might lead to misunderstandings.

This said, I should like to add a footnote to the story. Following the publication of my book in 1952, I underwent a course of training at Manchester College, Oxford, and am now minister of the Unitarian Church at Brighton.

JOHN ROWLAND

Brighton

Recent Foreign Theology

The Theology of Sin. An important Roman Catholic collective work on the Theology of Sin has appeared.¹ It contains chapters on Sin in the Old Testament, by A. Gelin, and in the New Testament, by A. Descamps, chapters on Sin in the thought of the Primitives, by J. Goetz, and in Greek thought, by A. Jagu, chapters on Original Sin, by Ch. Boyer, and on Actual Sin and Mortal and Venial Sin, by M. Huftier, followed by a chapter on the doctrine of the Eastern Church, by V. Palachkovsky, and one on Protestant views, by C. Vogel. The last consists of but ten pages, and is scarcely adequate. It condemns Protestant teaching because it does not distinguish between mortal and venial sins. The most valuable part of the volume will be found in the exposition of Roman doctrine, and particularly the chapters by M. Huftier, who brings much the longest contribution to the volume. The whole is a solid and scholarly work, well documented and deserving of careful study.

Beza on the Rights of Rulers. In 1573 Theodore Beza asked the Council of Geneva for permission to publish a book on the rights of rulers. This was within a year of the St. Bartholomew's massacre in Paris, and the Genevan authorities were nervous of arousing the hostility of their neighbour, and refused permission. In the following year the work appeared in French from a French press, and later in the original Latin. An English translation has now been published in South Africa, with an Introduction telling the story of the book,² the historical importance of which deserves not to be forgotten. The work discusses

in what circumstances and under what leadership revolt against tyranny is justified. Its tenets underlay all the agitations for rights and liberties in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and there is special appropriateness in its republication to-day, when new demands for rights and liberties are being made, and when liberty is in chains in many countries.

Review of Biblical Studies. The *Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete* is well established as an indispensable tool of research. Volume vi, for the years 1958-59, has now been issued.³ It contains more than twenty-two hundred entries of articles in a very large number of journals from all over the world, with a brief abstract of each. The entries are classified under the various aspects of Biblical study, so that it is easy to see what appeared on any subject of immediate interest. There are more than two hundred entries on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Future issues will probably see a steady increase on the thirteen devoted to the Coptic Gnostic texts. Of particular value are the abstracts of articles written in the less accessible languages or in journals not easily available. Most of the abstracts are written in German, but some are in French and English. They have been prepared by an international and interconfessional team of scholars. Every good theological library should subscribe for this publication, and every scholar engaged in Biblical research will save much time and enrich his work by consulting it.

Alleman Memorial Volume. The late Dr. H. C. Alleman was little known outside America save, perhaps, for a one-volume Old Testament Commentary of which he was joint editor. A memorial volume has been issued, containing a brief appreciation and bibliography of his writings, some devotional studies of his based on the Psalms, and

³ Patmos Verlag, Düsseldorf; DM 46.

¹ *Theologie du péché* (Bibliothèque de Theologie, II vii.) [1960]. Desclée, Tournai.

² *Theodore Beza: Concerning the Rights of Rulers over their Subjects and the Duty of Subjects towards their Rulers*, tr. by H.-L. Gonin, with an Introduction by A. A. van Schelven, ed. by A. H. Murray. Hollandsche Afrikaansche Uitgevers Maatschappij, Capetown.

eight essays, all save one by American scholars, on Biblical subjects.¹ The essayists include Professor Hempel, who writes on 'Die Faktizität der Geschichte im Biblischen Denken' (the only essay not in English); G. E. Mendenhall, who writes on 'The Relation of the Individual to Political Society in Ancient Israel'; H. S. Gehman, who writes on 'Natural Law and the Old Testament'; H. L. Creager, who writes on 'The Grace of God in Second Isaiah'; E. E. Flack, who writes on 'The Concept of God in the Greek translation of Isaiah'; R. T. Stamm, who writes on 'Luke-Acts and Three Cardinal Ideas in the Gospel of John'; and J. M. Myers, who writes on 'The Cultus and its Significance'. The whole forms a worthy memorial of a man of piety and learning, whose serenity of spirit seems to have made a particular impression on his friends.

Zwingli on Righteousness. A monograph by H. Schmid is devoted to the study of the teaching of Zwingli on the relation between Law and Gospel, based on the reformer's *Von göttlicher und menschlicher Gerechtigkeit*.² After a brief glance at the views of Aquinas and Luther, the author analyses in a long series of chapters Zwingli's views on the relation between Church and State carefully and thoroughly, occasionally breaking a lance with Paul Wernle, Emil Brunner, and other scholars. He recognizes the relativity of Zwingli's teaching, and in his epilogue observes that while the reformer's work was fruitful in his own day, the problem with which he dealt needs to be re-examined in our day, when we live in a very different world, both politically and in other respects. To Zwingli the Church and State were but two aspects of the same community, and his philosophical and anthropological presuppositions were other than ours. Solutions of problems which might seem valid in the relatively simple conditions of the sixteenth century can no longer be found satisfactory in the ever-growing complexity of the modern world.

Testaments of XII Patriarchs. It has commonly been believed that the *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* was a Jewish work that had received a number of Christian interpolations. Some years ago de Jonge argued that the work itself was post-Christian. The finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls—amongst which fragments of an Aramaic *Testament*

of *Levi* have figured—has directed fresh attention to this work, and M. Philonenko has now published a fresh study of the alleged Christian interpolations. This was first published in the form of articles in *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuse*, and has now been re-issued in book form.³ The author believes that the work emanated from the Essenes, and that most of the supposed interpolations are original to it, and are to be interpreted in relation to the Essenes, as we meet them in the Qumrân texts. The Greek text of the Testaments has come to us through Christian copyists, and he finds a few additions from their hands, but these are very slight compared with those which Charles found. The Slavonic version contains far more interpolations. Philonenko accordingly concludes that the Testaments are of great importance for the study of the Messianic doctrines of the time of Jesus.

Brunner Festschrift. Twenty-seven of the friends of Emil Brunner have contributed essays dealing with various aspects of the mission of the Church in the modern world⁴ to a volume published to celebrate his seventieth birthday, in December 1959. Amongst the essays some deal with the practical mission of the Church in social service—'Good Samaritan' service—or with the more philosophical aspects of Christian thought, others with the problems confronting the Church in face of the political and moral situation of to-day, with its widespread secularisation, or with the new problems that modern technical achievements have brought, or with new forms of service and of approach to those outside the Christian fellowship, while others deal with questions confronting the Church in its foreign missions in the new ecumenical age, and one essay is devoted to the subject of Christianity and Judaism. All the essays are written in German, and all offer some contribution to contemporary Christian thought. To list their titles would be wearisome, and to summarize their contents impossible in the space available here, where all that can be done is to indicate broadly the range of themes with which they deal, and to commend the volume to all who are interested. Professor Brunner has many friends in the English-speaking world, and they will find here a worthy tribute to one of the creative Christian leaders of our time.

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester

¹ *Biblical Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman*, ed. by J. M. Myers, O. Reimherr, H. H. Bream [1960]. Augustin, Locust Malley, New York; \$6.00.

² *Zwingli's Lehre von der göttlichen und menschlichen Gerechtigkeit*. Studien zur Dogmengeschichte und systematischen Theologie, 12 [1959]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich; Swiss Fr. 19.00.

³ *Les interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des douze Patriarches et les Manuscrits de Qoumrân* [1960]. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.

⁴ *Der Auftrag der Kirche in der modernen Welt* [1959]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich.

Entre Nous

Let Us Sing to His Praise and Glory

Everyone knows the famous saying of Fletcher of Saltoun: 'Let me make a nation's songs and I care not who makes its laws'. And we might well paraphrase that by saying: 'Let me make a Church's hymns and I care not who writes its theology'. In *They Wrote Our Hymns* (S.C.M.; 6s. net) Dr. Hugh Martin has fascinatingly retold the life story of the greatest of the great hymn-writers, and has examined their thought.

The great hymn-writers were astonishingly fertile in production. Isaac Watts wrote seven hundred and fifty hymns; James Montgomery four hundred; Horatius Bonar six hundred; William Walsham How fifty-four; John Ellerton ninety-eight; John Mason Neale's collected hymns require a volume of four hundred and sixty pages; and all this pales into insignificance beside Charles Wesley's six thousand five hundred hymns in more than thirty different metres.

It is not unfair to call Isaac Watts the founder of the use of the hymn, although of course there were writers of hymns before him. It all began one evening when he and his father were on their way home from church and when the young Isaac complained of the dreariness of the hymns they had been singing. 'Then give us something better, young man', retorted his father—and by the next Sunday the young man had begun. The versatility of Watts, who was no more than five feet in height and who was never well, is amazing. He was a notable philosopher, and, to quote Johnson: 'Every man acquainted with the common principles of human action will look with veneration on the writer who is at one time combating Locke and at another making a catechism for children in their fourth year'. There is in Watts an almost sacrificial simplicity. Johnson included him in 'The Lives of the Poets', but Watts deliberately eschewed the higher ranges of poetry: 'Some of the beauties of poesy are neglected and some are wilfully defaced, lest a more exalted turn of thought or language should darken or disturb the devotions of the weakest souls'. He wrote not as he wished but as he felt he must.

The hymns of Charles Wesley are intensely personal; they are 'I' hymns rather than 'we' hymns, and it is there that they may indeed be open to criticism. In Charles Wesley's hymns we come upon two very definite and characteristic Methodist beliefs. We come on the magnificent

Methodist *universalism* as opposed to Calvinistic double predestination.

Help us Thy mercy to extol,
Immense, unfathomed, unconfined;
To praise the Lamb who died for all,
The general Saviour of mankind.

Thy undistinguishing regard
Was cast on Adam's fallen race;
For all Thou hast in Christ prepared
Sufficient, sovereign, saving grace.

We come on Methodist *perfectionism*. The Christian is 'at once sinful and saved'. The 'humble, patient love of God and our neighbour' can rule our actions. Sanctification can and must follow justification:

Let others hug their chains;
For sin and Satan plead,
And say, from sin's remains
They never can be freed.
Rejoice in hope, rejoice with me!
We shall from all our sins be free.

Here there is the picture of that sweetly astonishing soul William Walsham How who in his time refused the bishoprics of Natal, Cape Town, New Zealand, Montreal, Jamaica, Manchester, and Durham to work first in the slums of East London and later in Wakefield. He was the Bishop who began by reciting Humpty Dumpty to a row of tiny tots fearfully paraded to meet him, and who had only one title of which he was proud—'The Children's Bishop'.

Dr. Martin has given us a book at once scholarly and popular, and a book which will be of very great value to the preacher, the teacher, and the organist and choir. He generally succeeds in being strictly objective, but once he lashes out. Speaking of F. W. Faber, he writes: 'How his meaningless rhythm "Hark, hark, my soul" is tolerated at all, I cannot imagine'. Some of us might say that such a verdict displays a startling lack of imagination!

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED,
Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK,
38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested
that all literary communications be addressed to
THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.